



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Presented by 75
James Edpath.
to the Astor Library





Presented by

June 15

THE
HISTORY OF DEMOCRACY:

OR,
POLITICAL PROGRESS,

HISTORICALLY ILLUSTRATED,

FROM THE EARLIEST TO THE LATEST PERIODS.

BY

NAHUM CAPEN, LL.D.,

AUTHOR OF "THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; ITS DUTIES TO ITSELF
AND ITS RESPONSIBLE RELATIONS TO OTHER COUNTRIES," ETC., ETC.


WITH PORTRAITS OF DISTINGUISHED MEN.

VOL. I.

vol 2 never published.

HARTFORD:
AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1874.



17177-

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
NAHUM CAPEN,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

NEW YORK
1874
LIBRARY

TO

THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

OF ALL PARTIES,

AND

TO THE LOVERS OF TRUTH AND FREEDOM

IN ALL COUNTRIES,

THIS VOLUME IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

HISTORY is the science of knowledge. Science is nothing without knowledge, but there may be much knowledge without science. It is only by the aid of science that knowledge is made practically useful. Science not only comprehends the knowledge of things and principles,—but the supreme skill of the understanding in discovering the natural system of their development.

The History of Democracy, is a history of principles,—as connected with the nature of man and society. All principles centre in God,—the eternal source of **TRUTH, WISDOM, JUSTICE AND LOVE**. As the infinite attributes of Deity give existence, order and direction to the universe of being, so the faculties of man are the ordained agents of the divine will, as made known by Providence, and within the limits of humanity. In the sublime truths of Christianity is to be found the high standard of human conduct and endeavor.

From these relations of mind turn to the physical world. Contemplate all external objects, in themselves and in their relations. This outward view comprehends all the great interests of the world. It embraces thought, labor, inventive genius, and skill,—industry in its beneficent rewards and necessities; commerce, in its enlarging enterprise and influences; science, with its keen and patient discernments of the natural laws; the arts, in their beautifying refinements; society, and nations, under the conditions of success, or failure, peace, or war; government, with its collective power and authorized agencies; the theories of human agency, the unnumbered ways and methods of doing the same things,—which are the perpetual sources of inquiry, discussion, experiment and action. The record of this vast activity, of its mean-

ing and uses, is history. Every subject in its simple elements has its basis in principle, and its record in progress. In all this diversity truth demonstrates harmony.

The events which illustrate political freedom in America, for the elucidation of principles, may be divided into three periods,—from the first settlements to the separate formation of the Colonies; from the distinct organization of the Colonies to the Revolution and the formation of the American Union; and from the date of the Constitution of the United States to the present time. This subdivision has not been formally observed in this work, but practically, it will be.

All events, identified with the growth of a nation are more or less important, as they serve to illustrate principles. They may be classified according to their origin, nature and tendencies. They are of a transient or permanent nature. Some end almost with their beginning, while others discover elements of perpetual influence. A fact, is the record of truth, and can never be obliterated.

Every period of a nation's growth has its standard in principle. The colonists, in America, as subjects, had theirs in Monarchy. As men, they found it in Republicanism. When they found that they could not defend their principles, either as colonists or men, they united as citizens to form a union that would secure the distinct and extended benefits of national existence. The laws of national transition permit no break in the illimitable chain of cause and effect. The links that belong together will be brought together, though centuries intervene. As space gives locality to matter, so time gives opportunity to mind. All the events of these succeeding periods are to be attentively observed in their nature, studied in their tendencies, and measured in their unlimited relations.

The monarchist and the republican; the tory and the democrat; the papist and the protestant; the puritan, and the great family of dissenters; the quaker, the pioneer, the adventurer, the fanatic and the theorist,—all, at one time or another, in some way, have been identified with the beginning and the growth of the American Republic. It is the purpose of this work to review their varied and combined labors

and influences, and humbly to gather wisdom from their experience to serve as a guide to future endeavor.

If what the author has written shall tend in any degree to encourage inquiry, to enlarge and strengthen the patriotic resolves of manhood, to quicken and deepen the spirit of duty that dignifies citizenship, and recognizes the rule of God in the government of nations, he will have just occasion to congratulate himself that his labors have not been without some reward.

MOUNT IDA, BOSTON, SEPTEMBER, 1874.



son, said "all were federalists." Gen. Jackson. Republicans. Sir James Mackintosh, respecting Tory Party. Sheridan's reply to Burke. Tory principles. Addison on Toryism. Tory Creed, (Appendix, 617 p.) Mission of the Tory Party. Tory language. Burke, Col. Barré and Lord North. pp. 17-21

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Origin of the word *democracy*. Guizot, respecting it. The principles of Democracy. Col. Barré and Lord North, in Parliament. Fox, respecting Pitt, the younger. Mission of Democracy. Vox populi est Vox Dei. Best form of government. Democracy in England and France. De Tocqueville. pp. 21-29

OBJECTS OF HISTORY.

Objects of history stated. Man, capable of progress, the agent of knowledge. The certainty of the physical sciences. The business of the historian. The growth of nations. pp. 29-31

MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF CREATION.

The Hebrew Government, that of God. Its Spirit of Love. History of Moses. Egypt and China. pp. 31-32

INTERPRETATION OF LANGUAGE. UNCERTAINTIES OF HISTORY.

Situation of Civilized men varies and renews itself incessantly. Language does not change so rapidly as things. Unity and diversity of society. Christian civilization. Demosthenes and Cicero. pp. 32-34

REPUBLICS OF GREECE AND ROME.

Language of Politics. Ancient Greece, Democracy of. The people of Athens. Lycurgus, Lacedæmon. pp. 34-38

REPUBLIC OF ROME.

Its history, Decline and Fall. The causes. pp. 38-45

HUMAN PROGRESS.

Principles and evidences of Human Progress. pp. 45-46

FRANCE.

History of Freedom in France. pp. 46-52

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF NATIONS.

The study of Principles. Barbarism and Civilization. Real and apparent aspects of Society. pp. 52-53

ENGLAND.

Locality, origin and mission of. Ruled by a foreign power. William, and Feudalism. The Heptarchy. Sovereign Power. pp. 53-57

PROTECTORATE OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

Sketch of Charles I, and Cromwell. Their respective merits considered. Events of the Period. Their teachings. The Puritans, Royalty, its means of safety. Religious Liberty. Civil Liberty. Magna Charta. Habeas Corpus Act. Freedom of Parliament. House of Commons. Introductory Remarks. pp. 57-73

VOX POPULI EST VOX DEI.

Sacred feature of Democracy. Ancient maxim. Spiritual progress. Christianity. Religion "the nurse of the people." The rule of Deity in all ages of the world. No religion to be despised. Mighty sway of the religious principle. Evidences in the truth

of the maxim, to be found in the origin and growth of the American Colonies. Triumphs of Democracy. pp. 78-88

AMERICAN COLONIES. POLITICAL HISTORY.

Objects of Political History. Faculties of the Human Mind. Herschel on the Physical Sciences. Human agency. England in 16th and 17th centuries—to be studied in connection with the Settlement of America. pp. 87-88

THE PRINCIPLES OF COLONIZATION.

The inward and outward action of the mind. Bacon and Franklin—pioneers of knowledge. Sir Isaac Newton, La Place, Virgil, Columbus. Discoveries of the 15th Century. Glory of the 17th Century. Honor to the Pioneer. Daniel Boone. Franklin, Professors Henry and Morse and The Telegraph. Sismondi on Colonization of the Greeks, Egyptians and Phœnicians. Homer, the father of Geography. Bible, commanding colonization. Spanish colonies. Colonies of North America. pp. 88-96

ORIGIN OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

Discovery of America by Columbus. England, France, Spain, Germany, Switzerland and Holland, as nations. Periods of 16th and 17th Centuries. Mariner's compass and gunpowder. Age of vipers. Toleration a virtue or crime. The Inquisition. Industry and Taxation. Women at the Parliament House demanding redress of grievances. Religious and Civil Liberty. pp. 96-103

THE PURITANS IN ENGLAND.

The Bible, the Puritans statute book. Puritan, a name of reproach. Views of Puritans. Peter Wentworth, a bold Puritan of Parliament. Remarkable examination before a Committee of Parliament. His loyalty and independence. pp. 102-109

THE PURITANS IN AMERICA.

Political survey of the Colonies. The Pilgrims at Plymouth. The thirteen colonies. Motives of the Puritans. Spirit of liberty preserved by them. Hume quoted. Hon. Joel Parker, quoted. Puritans, saw in God a King above royalty. pp. 109-111

LOVE OF NATIVE LAND.

"Mother Country," no unmeaning phrase. Puritan's love of Home. pp. 111-113

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE PURITANS.

The Right of Englishmen to emigrate. John Adams, quoted. Compact on board of the Mayflower. Signatures to Compact. p. 113

INSTRUCTION, NOT SELF-AGGRANDIZEMENT, THE OBJECT OF POLITICAL HISTORY.

Progressive measures. Error of Confounding Original Causes with Human Motives. p. 115

DEMOCRACY NO NEW SYSTEM OF MODERN TIMES.

Democracy in all ages. Democracy and the American Continent. p. 116

A CONTEST FOR THE GREATEST LIBERTY.

Disposition of the Human Mind to extend control. Colonies placed in new relations. Revolution in Russia. Execution of Ryleeff. Teachings of the Bible. p. 117

CONDITIONS OF NATIONAL EXISTENCE.

Sources of National Existence. Growth and Greatness. Survey of different Nations. Truth and Justice. p. 119

COLONISTS' HABITS OF APPLICATION AND PRUDENCE EARLY ESTABLISHED.

Pride of Duty. Bounds of Duty. Wants limited within the compass of stern necessities. Idleness and Frivolity rebuked p. 120

FORMATION OF CHARACTER AIDED BY EXTERNAL OBJECTS.

Man, not alone. The Agent of Power, or the Subject of Submission. Favored or opposed by circumstances. New England in 1638—the Climate of. Rev. Robert Cushman. p. 121

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

Analysis of the subject. This great Principle Developed by the Colonists. Massachusetts Charter of 1628. Sovereignty of Democracy. Sovereignty of the Religious World. Political sovereignty. Territory the foundation of interest. Union and State Rights. Town Governments. pp. 122-126

THE EXERCISE OF EQUAL RIGHTS.

Cannot spring from unequal beginnings. Results of imperfect Laws. Condition of France. Errors of Socialists. "Live and let live." p. 126

EQUALITY IS BEST COMMENCED IN POVERTY.

Poverty aided by necessity. Poverty of Possession, of Sentiment. The gifts of Humanity. Property of Colonists. Gov. Bradford, Miles Standish, Edward Gray. Majority Principle. Sovereignty of Democracy. Guizot and Rousseau. Merchant adventurers of London. Articles of Agreement. pp. 126-129

THE PRINCIPLE OF INTEGRITY.

Democracy nothing without Integrity. Were the Puritans honest? Integrity necessary to Sovereignty. Basis of eternal Order. Colonists strict constructionists. Institutions indicate character. : p. 130

POPULAR EDUCATION.

Power of Knowledge. Learning in England in 1640. Livingston's Penal Code of Louisiana. New England Free Schools. Harvard College. Self-knowledge. Education in different nations. Errors of Historians. Power of Truth. Popular Education in England, France, Germany, Spain, Russia, China, Prussia. Tyrants and Knowledge. Criminals, their Education. Peter Wentworth and the House of Commons. The Farmer. The Mechanic. Mind practically omnipresent. Comprehensive views of the Puritans of the importance of Education. The American Union. pp. 131-140

LEGISLATION OF THE PURITANS.

The Bible. Theocratic Rule. Equal Rights. Division of Lands. Trial by Jury. No ambition for office. Their Laws. The Indian. American Continent. Revision of Laws. New Plymouth. William Penn and Pennsylvania. Revolution in England. . pp. 140-150

COLONIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Three kinds Colonial Governments: *The Provincial; The Proprietary; The Charter.* p. 151

PERIODS OF PARTY. RESULTS OF PARTY PRINCIPLES.

Permanent and progressive Parties. Periods of action. Results. Religion. Science. Political Parties. Human Power. Ideas. p. 154

POLITICAL PARTIES OF THE COLONIES.

Facts of History classified. Want of continuity in Colonial History. Colonists were Party men. Their views of Parliament. Toleration. Virginia and Massachusetts—the *Mothers of States*. Rhode Island. Roger Williams. Religious Liberty. Pedigree of Freedom. Survey of Colonial events. Democracy in England and America. Revolutions and Commotions of Europe. Treaty of Utrecht. Foreign control of the Colonies. Questions of Interests and of Rights. pp. 155-167

THE SOURCES OF CIVIL POWER.

Three sources of power. Royalty. Most men comparatively poor. Industry, Wants

CONTENTS.

xiii

and Wealth. The King, Lords and Parliament. Liberty and obedience. God and Liberty. Sources of Colonial success. p. 168

VIRGINIA.

First Settlers. Date of Settlement. King James and the Colony. First Assembly in America. Early Parties. Government of the Colony. Productions. Want of Enterprise. Charles I. and Cromwell. Sentiments of the Planters. Annals of the Colony. Revolution of 1688. James II. William and Mary. Statesmen of the Colony. The Mother of States and Statesmen. pp. 171-182

SOUTH CAROLINA.

First Settlement of the Colony. Motives of Colonists. From every Nation. Constitution and Laws framed by John Locke. Parties. Colony divided. North Carolina. Education. Democracy. pp. 182-188

NEW YORK.

First settlement. Business purposes. Dutch Proprietors. Discovery of the North River. Manhattan Island—New Amsterdam—Brooklyn. Dutch West India Company. The States General. Government of Holland. The Colony one of Holland's Work Shops. New Netherlands. Capt. John Underhill. Peter Stuyvesant. The Puritan and Dutch Republican. Tyranny of Wealth. Democrats of England and Holland. Freedoms and Exemptions. Patroons. Results of Democracy. New Jersey. Party Contests. pp. 188-202

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

New Hampshire, subject of Mortgage and Sale. Character above property. Fruits of persecution in Scotland and Massachusetts. First Settlers. Their character, bravery and perils. Fernando Gorges and Capt. John Mason. United with Massachusetts. Divided. Claims of the King and Proprietaries. Religious Liberty. Cromwell and Wheelwright. Democracy and its triumphs. pp. 202-206

GEORGIA.

Settlement of Georgia—an experiment of Benevolence. Colonization and Charity. Lord Percival, James Oglethorpe, and others. Royalty and Charity, in Parliament together. Imperfections of Theories. Composition of Progress. The Jails of Great Britain. Prisoners released for Transportation. The Charter of Georgia. The Political Foundation of. Georgia to be made a Silk, Wine, Oil, and Drug growing Colony. Extension of Christianity. Jews emigrate from London to Georgia. Designs of Trustees. Their Errors. Truths developed by failures. pp. 206-219

MARYLAND.

First Settlement of Maryland. It was named in the Charter *Terra Maria*—Mary's Land. Puritans of Maryland. Wm. Clayborne, Cecilus Calvert, Second Lord Baltimore. Population of Maryland. Sir Lionel Copley, appointed Governor by Wm. III. Intolerance of Virginia gave birth to Maryland. Papacy. Calvert Family. Representative Government. Religious Freedom. Democracy recognized by a Catholic. Zeal for extending Christianity. Toleration. Kindness to the Indians. Lord Baltimore invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to emigrate to Maryland. Catholicism and Protestantism. Charles I, and Charles II. Democracy. pp. 219-221

PENNSYLVANIA.

A Quaker Settlement. Origin. Wm. Penn. Spirit of Peace and of Humility. Family of Penn. Government of Pennsylvania. Frame of. Penn endeavored to improve Colonial Government. A believer in Fundamental Principles. His high position. His Motives and belief. His Candor and simplicity. One of the Trustees of New Jersey. Territory, and the Government of New Jersey. Penn's relations to the Crown. Quakerism. Quakerism—a Democracy. The teachings of the Bible. Equality. Doctrine

of George Fox. Persecution of the Quakers. Laws against Dissenters. Penn's Proclamation to his vassals and subjects. Certain Conditions and Concessions. Penn visits America. Is opposed to Monopolies. His Reception. Quaker Proprietaries in England declared for Democracy. Penn's views of Government. "The Frame." Laws agreed upon in England. Character and Defence of Penn. Letter of Penn. Franklin's Review of Pennsylvania. Party Controversies. Troubles. Proprietaries claim exemption from Taxation. What the History of Pennsylvania teaches. . . pp. 231-76

MASSACHUSETTS, CONNECTICUT, AND RHODE ISLAND.

First Settlement of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Pilgrims at Plymouth. Province of Massachusetts. United Colonies of New England. Maine and New Hampshire. Provisional Government. Territory of Connecticut. Dutch, of New Amsterdam, build a Fort at Hartford. Settlement at New Haven. Charter Oak. Rhode Island—founded by Roger Williams. Providence Plantation. Democratic Government established. Portsmouth, Newport and Providence. First General Assembly at Portsmouth. First Government in Providence. "Democratical." First and Second Charters granted by Charles II. Roger Williams. Fathers of Connecticut were Republicans. Their Laws, and their Character. New England—the centre of Democracy. Intolerant Laws of Connecticut. Religionists, and not Politicians. A Continental Policy. Drummer's Defence of New England Charters. Massachusetts and the Home Government. Party prudence of the Colonists. War against Indians. Temper of Great Britain towards the Colonies. British Commissioners appointed by Charles II, to hear and determine Complaints of Colonists. Commission resisted in Massachusetts. Search for Whalley and Goffe. Reception of the British Commissioner by "the Trained Bands of Hartford." Sir Edmund Andros, and a body of Troops in Hartford. Demanded the Charter of Connecticut. Increased jealousy of the Crown, and firmness of the Colonists. pp. 277-286

POLITICAL AND NATIONAL PROGRESS. SUPREMACY OF MIND.

Man himself makes the World. Origin and Growth of Nations. The Commonwealth of Faculties. Phenomena of the External World. Themes for contemplation. Astronomy, Magnetic Needle, etc., known to the Chinese at an early period. Geology. Idea of History—of Greeks and Romans. Nature considered rationally. Beginning of a Nation. Democracy in its combinations. Instruction of peace in Ipswich in 1765. A new Nation the offspring of the past. Votaries of Science, of Morals, of Government. pp. 187-192

WHAT CONSTITUTES A NATION.

Growth of Nations governed by Fixed Laws. France, Spain and England. Education. Blackstone in America. Burke respecting Laws of Empire. Despotism and Democracy compared. Rank and Position of United States. Conditions of Social Peace. Guizot's Views. Revolutionary Periods of France. National and Political Unity. What a Nation is, and is not. pp. 292-297

NATIONS ARE NOT FORMED BY CHANCE.

Man only an humble agent. He can neither make nor destroy.

CONVENTIONAL CONFLICT AND ACTION.

Limited motives of Man. Illimitable designs of Providence. New period of power. Duty a necessity. Jealousy of rulers. America not annexed to the Realm. Principles the levers of Progress. Government of England, a progressive Monarchy. Democracy of Republicanism. Industry of American Continent. Political relations of Duty. pp. 297-300

GOVERNMENT, ITS OBJECTS AND ENDS.

Government defined, Human Government. Divine Government. Different writers quoted. Conscience, Intelligence and Judgment. A good or bad Government. Mont-

esquieu on the English Government. Government of the Saints. The Tyrant's Plea—necessity. Military Power. Church variable and divided. Government of Nature. Good and Evil. Christian Rule. Vox Populi est Vox Dei. Precepts of Solomon. Infinite Wisdom. Human Wisdom. Instinct. Origin of Government. Government and Knowledge. What Government really is. pp. 300-314

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT.

Organization of Government. Government one thing, its Administration quite another. Guizot on Democracy. Guizot on Administration of Government. Distinction between Constitution and Government. Defined by Bolingbroke. British Constitution. pp. 314-318

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

Government Absolute or Democratic. Constitutions classified. The British Constitution. One of Growth. Hallam respecting. Its Democracy its chief Glory. The Heptarchy. Origin of Towns and Counties. Character of the British Constitution. pp. 318-323

THE BEST FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

Human judgment not equal to human wishes. What form of Government best. Monarchy the best or worst form. Plato. Conditions of comparison. p. 323

MONARCHY.

A Monarchy, what it is. Established by Nature. Mixed Monarchy. Genius of Monarchy. Subject discussed in Convention of Pennsylvania. John Dickinson. His speech. Monarchy, a historical fact. Royal Pedigree. Monarchy and Democracy. "Farmer's Letters." Monarchy—by whom favored. Not necessary to England. Cromwell. Colonists—divided as to Monarchy. The Clergy. Monarchy, not favored by the Bible. French Revolution. Whig and Tory Parties. Monarchy a Party Question. pp. 334-339

REPUBLICANISM.

True definition of Republicanism. Composition of Republics. Ultimate Truths. Conditions of Republican existence. Government of Mexico. France. England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. All good Governments must be Republican. Republican spirit of the Colonists. Their Loyalty. Republicanism not a Party Question. Colonies independent of one another. Prepared for a Crisis. Democratic Republic. pp. 339-344

POLITICAL PERIODS OF ENGLAND, PRECEDING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Teachings of History. Progress seen in long intervals. Principles of Party. Nations to be studied together. Identity of Truth. Democracy the same everywhere. Survey of Political Events of England, from the Commonwealth of Cromwell, to the reign of Geo. III, and American Revolution. Commonwealth of Cromwell. Events of his rule—His character. pp. 344-356

CHARLES THE SECOND.

Charles II, and Cromwell compared. The Restoration. Character of Charles II. His popularity. His views of Politics and Duty. Presbyterians and Independents. State of Parties. Parliament had no confidence in the King. Politics and the Pulpit. Burke. Act of Oblivion. Episcopacy. Hobbes. Habits of the King. Sale of Dunkirk. Puritans. Clarendon. Frequent Parliaments. The Cabal. Era of Sin and degradation. Rule of Providence. Liberty in England. Classes and Parties. King's last Parliament. Authors cited. Patriotic leaders. Popish and Rye-house Plots. Period of Fanaticism and Horrors. Democracy of the times. Great events of England. Triple Alliance. Degrading habits of the King. His resentments. Shameless Bribery. Relations between Louis XIV and the King of England. Character of Louis XIV. The King and the Commons. Marriage of Prince of Orange and Mary. Klug

ceased to be merry. His illness and death. Death-bed scene. A Catholic Priest sent for. Rumors as to the causes of his death. Events of the Reign of Charles II. Lord Bolingbroke respecting the Whig and Tory Parties. Barillon's Correspondence. Sidney—his views and character. The Effrontery of the Tory Party. University of Oxford. Indemnity Act. Exclusion Bill. Test Act. Freedom of London. Large Cities Democratic. Oxford—strong-hold of Toryism. Royalty not honored by Charles II. pp. 356-396

JAMES THE SECOND.

Charles II, and James II,—compared. Circumstances favorable to James. Congratulated by Quakers. Review of Charles I. Cromwell and Charles II. Character of James. Proclaimed without dissent. His knowledge of the relations between Louis XIV and Charles II. Extreme Measures of the Tories. Extreme views of James. Divine Right of King's. Monmouth's Claim to the Crown. His Rebellion. His Execution. Persecution of influential Dissenters. Bunyan, Baxter, Locke, Howe. The Bloody Record of Jeffreys, the Lord Chief Justice. James, a consistent Tyrant. A Papist and infallible. Acknowledged the Pope. Superstition—what it is. Entry of the Pope's nuncio. Conflict of Parties. Incapacity of James. Ignorance of the People. Trial of the Bishops. Control of the Army. Unprincipled Parties. Party of the People. Marriage of Prince of Orange. Character of Authors of the Revolution. Invasion of England. Declaration of Popular Rights. Singular conduct of James. Union of best and worst men. Promises and treachery of James. Character of Prince of Orange. Importance of the Revolution. Charges against James. Declaration of Parliament. Revolution of 1688—defensive. Democracy. Crown made Elective. pp. 396-434

WILLIAM AND MARY.

Reign of William and Mary. Review of. His Difficulties and Trials. His Character. Deceived by the Tories. Reign of expensive extension. Revolution, a Triumph of Democracy. Declaration of Right. William complimented by Macaulay. . pp. 434-441

QUEEN ANNE.

Lady Anne, wife of Prince George of Denmark,—declared Queen. Great and small men in the public service. Alarm of the Whigs at the death of William. Anne—her capacity and education. A Tory, of narrow views and prejudices. Devoted to the Church. Duchess of Malboro's view of the Church. Anne's nice sense of decorum. Her Speech from the Throne. Dissenters persecuted. House of Lords—reconstructed. Test Act. Tories appointed to Office. Extreme Measures of the Tories. Elections. "Church in Danger." Religious Freedom in Ireland. Union with Scotland. Political Union. Parliament suggests a Second Marriage to the Queen. Dogmas of Theology. Augustan age of Literature. Distinguished Whigs and Tories. "The Examiner." "The Tatler." Alliance of Literature with Politics. Sir Richard Steele. His Expulsion and Defence. Democracy—not partisanship. Strength and weakness in Administration of Government. Duchess of Marlborough and Abigail Hill. War against France. Lord Marlborough. Bolingbroke as an adviser. War a condition of Injustice. Power, nature of. Peace. England and France. Louis XIV—defence of. Duke of Marlborough, character, acts and defence of. Greatness and weakness of Man. Inequality of Human Agency. Ostracism. Mythological character of Hercules. The Age of Marlborough—and his position in it. His Party experience, and his ultimate conclusions in favor of Democracy. His Loyalty. His Devotion to his wife. Mrs. Freeman and Mrs. Morley. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Montgomery. Party remedies. The no party man. The Duchess of Marlborough and the Queen.

THE MISSION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMAN.

Comparison of the Sexes. Two spheres of Duty. Mission of Man. Mission and characteristics of Woman. Female Suffrage. Taxation and Representation. Property. Distinguished Females. Beauty. Pleasures of Fashion. History of Woman. What

she has done and is able to do. Her connection with Government. Her Influence on Public Men. The Salic Law. Caius Marcius Coriolanus, his wife and mother. Women of France during the Revolution. Women of the Colonies—during the American Revolution. Views of Jefferson, Franklin, Hamilton, and other authors. Jealousy—analysis of. Woman and Democracy. Lines of Tennyson. pp. 471-490

DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

Defence of her character and acts. Self knowledge. Her love of property, and its uses. Her Mission. Her influence on her husband. Her relations with Queen Anne. pp. 491-497

MEASURES AND PARTY FEATURES OF THE REIGN OF ANNE.

Great Questions debated and decided. Violence of Party. Her treatment of Lord Marlborough. Responsibilities and difficulties of Commanders of Armies. Experience of the Duke of Marlborough. The Duke and the People. Bolingbroke, Harley and Mrs. Masham. Lord Marlborough's confidence in the Whigs, his detestation of Harley. Death of Anne. Royalty no power to bless a nation. The reign of Anne. pp. 441-506

GEORGE I.

Anne, and the Tory Party. George Lewis, under title of George I. His birth, education, character and marriage. Discards his wife. George, only the Elector of Hanover. Addison's opinion of him. Anecdotes, and uncertainties of George I. His Mistresses. A decided Whig. Addison as a Democrat. To him Democracy was Christianity. Democracy the same in all nations, in all time. The Herods and Pharaohs of the World. Rebellion of 1715. The Septennial Bill. The Party Caucus. Policy of George I. Conventional Rights of Political Parties. Mistakes of the Whig Party. Wm. III, and the Triennial Bill. Amusing chapter of party inconsistencies. For a temporary purpose, Tories favor popular Rights. Character of Shippen. Legislative Trusts. Evils of Hereditary Monarchy. Toryism adverse to Parental Affection. Peerage Bill. Controversy between Addison and Steele. Speculative Age. South Sea Bubble. Bolingbroke Proposes a New Party. What is a Whig? What is a Tory? Bolingbroke and the Women. Lament of Bolingbroke. Teachings of the reign of George I. A nominal Democracy superior to a real Monarchy. Importance of Royalty still undiscovered. pp. 506-530

GEORGE II.

The events which marked the accession of George II to the British throne. Royalty aided by an indifferent democratic faith—superior to Toryism. Record of hereditary monarchy. Gideon of Manasseh. Abimelech and Jotham. Fable of the Trees. The bramble anointed King. Person and Character of George II. Power of ciphers. No author can write accurately except of his own times. George II. governed by the Queen. His domestic life. Rule of weak and bad men. Character of the Queen. The King and queen, as parents. Frederic, the Prince of Wales. George II. Sir Robert Walpole, and Sir Spencer Compton. Interview between Sir Robert and the King. Systems of political guarantees. Guizot quoted. Different ways of doing the same thing. Habits of social life, and of parties. Representative party men. Democracy always triumphs, Toryism, never. George II. believed in royalty and democracy. Party appeals to young men. An age of corruption. Great influence of Speaker Onslow. State of parties. Inconsistencies of parties. Prohibitive legislation. Democracy, defended by a Tory. Reduction of Interest. Walpole's treatment of the Dissenters. Test Act. The Quakers. Frederic, Prince of Wales, his sad fate. The Sloth. Sir Charles Bell, quoted. Lord Hervey—the Boswell of the King and Queen. His description of the Prince of Wales. The power of to-day. The Prince of Wales refused admission to the death bed of his mother. Revolting conduct of the King: Lines on Prince Fred. Thackery on the death-bed scene of the Queen. Reasons why women

should not engage in politics. Religious wars, the most bloody. Political frenzy. Alienations of the affections. Desperate expedients of the Tories. Influence of Pitt. History of principle. Excise Bill. The Place Bill. Repeal of the Septennial Act, proposed by Bolingbroke. Writ of Habeas Corpus. The test of parties. Earl Camden. The discretion of a judge the law of tyrants. Examples of political history. Sir Robert Walpole—his character and policy—His resignation. Created Earl of Orford. Pulteney. "The statesman," a satire. Walpole and Pulteney. Coalition Whigs. Carteret, his habits and character. A convenient tool. "The drunken administration." Pelham made Chancellor of the exchequer. Royalty leagued with incapacity. "Broad-bottomed administration." Death of Bolingbroke and Earl of Orford. Jealousy of Newcastle. Pitt called to the Cabinet. Dismissed and reinstated. Cooke's views of Pitt. Pitt's success due to democracy. His genius and principles. Bolingbroke and Pitt—compared. Achievements of democracy. Continued failures of Royalty and Toryism. pp. 530-586

GEORGE III.

Propitious period for royalty to have a new start. England prosperous, and parties were tranquil. Policy of George III. Resolved to be more than King. Royalty naturally seeks toryism as an ally. Early character of the King. His education. His early loves. Tory party dead. Theory of no party. Pelham party. King influenced by his mother. "George, be King." Lord Camden's prediction respecting the King. The Interior Cabinet. The Pelham party. Appointment of Earl of Bute the King's favorite. Commercial greatness of England. John Wilkes, origin, character and influence. Tories trusted, and Whigs proscribed. "Men, not measures." Self-imposed duties of the King—difficult and dangerous. The "favorite." A headless party. Bute, and Pitt. Dr. Smollett, respecting Bute. Mind and passion. High qualities of Pitt. Tory sentiments of Lord Granville. Resignation of Bute. Negotiations with Pitt. Important period in the history of England. Tory party revived. Period of darkness. The future of England and America. The two great parties of the world—in conflict. The patriots of England and America. Nothing that is great and good for humanity impossible. Close of the first volume, and the commencement of the second. pp. 586-615

APPENDIX.

A Tory's Creed. How the people of England are represented. Theory of Political Trimmers. Enunciation of Toryism. Coriolanus, his wife and mother. The Empire State. Gov. Seymour's Lecture. The South Sea and other Schemes. List of Bubbles. Lines on Exchange Alley Bubbles. The importance of woman as woman. Early settlement of Connecticut. pp. 615-661

PORTRAITS OF DISTINGUISHED MEN.

PLATE I.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.
PATRICK HENRY.
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.
JOHN HANCOCK.
SAMUEL ADAMS.
JAMES MADISON.
THOMAS JEFFERSON.

PLATE II.

JOHN LOCKE.
JOHN MILTON.
SIR ISAAC NEWTON.
EDMUND BURKE.
JOSEPH ADDISON
LORD CAMDEN.
LORD CHATHAM.

HISTORY OF DEMOCRACY.



INTRODUCTORY.

PRINCIPLES OF PARTY.

WHAT thinking and acting are to the individual, party is to society.

Party is the great engine of human progress. It is a combination of men of similar views, and kindred sympathies, for moral or political supremacy. It leads to the war of knowledge upon ignorance, the conflict of holiness against sin, the struggles of freedom against tyranny. It is to be found in man as an individual, swayed by the opposing passions of the soul, whether for good or evil, and by the objects of choice, whether yielding to or resisting the spirit of temptation.¹ It is to be found in the numerous associations of society for influence, controlling customs, forming habits, advancing fashions, and modifying, limiting or extending, the social or domestic duties. It divides the church in regard to the sacred teachings of the holy scriptures; and sects spring up to defend their varying creeds, each opposing each, and each opposing all.² The votaries of science have their favorite schools and classics, and party zeal is made to quicken the conceptions of genius. Bold and righteous men rise up as partisans against the world, pledged as martyrs to reformation. The people of every nation divide and subdivide in regard to their national rights and interests, and we sometimes have the sublime spectacle of parties made up of emperors, kings and presidents; of empires, monarchies and republics, discussing the great principles of national law, intervention, and the balance of power.

A world without party would be incapable of progress. To believe in a world incapable of progress, is practical atheism. What the science of mechanics is to matter, party is to knowledge. The one leads to the improvement of material things, the other to the advancement of society. With a knowledge of the former, an Arkwright and a Fulton can enrich a people;

¹ Romans 7 : 15-23.

One thing establisheth the good of another;

² "All things are double one against another; and he hath made nothing imperfect. and who shall be filled with beholding his glory?" — Ecclesiastics 42 : 24, 25.

and with a just realization of the latter, a Locke, a Franklin, and a Washington, can bless a nation.

Party may be denominated the manifold form of moral power in action. Its elements are to be found in the principles of human nature. It is moved by the unyielding forces of instinctive impulse and ambition, and sustained by the illimitable resources of interest and of opinion. While it is temporarily perverted to subserve the cause of wrong and error, it permanently aids in opening the paths of truth. It has an onward and a conservative power, and whatever is conceived by one mind is sure to find its antagonistic principle in the mind of another.

No science, no great truth, is ever permitted to find favor without opposition, or credence without contest. Truth is passed through the conflict of opinion, as the oaks of the forest are nursed by the tempest and the whirlwind, every storm extending the roots and adding vigor to the branches. To oppose truth is to challenge attention, and to denounce it is to unfold its beauty and to establish its power.¹

It may be profitable, for a moment, to consider the various sources of party spirit, and to endeavor to understand in what way parties are made to subserve the great cause of humanity.

Man is both the agent of power and the subject of want. He is moved by passions, elevated by sentiments, and controlled by opinions. He first becomes the pupil of parents, heir to their errors, as well as the recipient of their wisdom and knowledge. He is early trained as a partisan; and often the child is seen to play the dogmatist with all the confidence of a philosopher, and all the zeal of a cardinal. He soon becomes familiar with the

¹ In speaking of political parties in England, Addison says, — "There is scarcely any man in England, of what denomination soever, that is not a free-thinker in politics, and hath not some particular notions of his own, by which he distinguishes himself from the rest of the community. Our island which was formerly called a nation of saints, may now be called a nation of statesmen." — * *. "Who hath not observed several parish clerks, that have ransacked Hopkins and Sternhold for staves in favor of the race of Jacob; after the example of their politic predecessors in Oliver's days, who, on every Sabbath, were for binding kings in chains and nobles in links of iron! You can scarcely see a bench of porters without two or three casuists in it, that will settle you the right of princes, and state the

bounds of the civil and ecclesiastical power, in the drinking of a pot of ale. What is more usual than, on a rejoicing night, to meet with a drunken cobbler bawling out for the church, and perhaps knocked down a little after, by an enemy in his own profession, who is a lover of moderation." — * *. "Almost every age, profession and sex among us, has its favorite set of ministers, and scheme of government.

"Our children are initiated into factions before they know their right hand from their left. They no sooner begin to speak but Whig and Tory are the first words they learn. They are taught in their infancy to hate one half of the nation; and contract all the virulence and passion of party, before they come to the use of their reason." — *Freeholder*, No. 53.

household words of cliques, creeds and platforms, and practises leadership by organizing imitation parties among his mates at the village school. Indeed, the little distinctions of boyhood often rise up, as formidable to children as the difficulties of nations appear to men. Their party lines are defined by the boundaries of a neighborhood, or by sectional districts, indicated, it may be, only by the cardinal points of the compass. Still, their young hearts leap in the strife of contest, though they have no interests at stake, and are conscious of no motive above that of mastering their antagonists.¹ This is no fiction, as, without doubt, most men will be able to testify from personal experience. It shows not only that the elements of party are to be found in the constitution of things, but that they exist in harmony with the fundamental powers of the mind.²

Men are governed by motives, and their motives are characterized by individual peculiarities. They are selfish or liberal, cruel or benevolent, just or unjust, timid or bold, safe or dangerous, oppressive or patriotic, according to the standard which each erects within himself, as his private or public rule of duty. But men cannot act alone. Every faculty of the mind is adapted to exert its peculiar power in society. All have something to ask, something to give, and something to do. Want is the basis of business, gain the incentive to enterprise. The various combinations of the mental faculties result in the great diversity of tastes, genius and capacity, which give employment and an interest to all. To possess the means of living, the comforts and pleasures of life, is a necessity of our existence. Hence, the institution of property,³ which is based upon the innate sense of acquisition. To be enabled to enjoy the fruits of one's own labor without hindrance or robbery, to protect the weak against the strong, the just against the unjust, is

¹ D'Aubigné speaks of a sect in Germany, Switzerland and England, who believed in the necessity of returning to the simplicity and innocence of childhood, that the truth is revealed by the Spirit to babes. They affected all the manners and sports of children. A recent traveller in the Western States says "that he saw, on one occasion, about a thousand men and women in a grove, rolling hoops, flying kites, playing ball, shooting marbles, leaping, running, wrestling, boxing, rolling and tumbling in the grass; the women caressing dolls, and men astride of sticks for horses, and the whole company intently engaged in all the sports of childhood." At last he ventured to ask what it meant. They told him they professed to be little children, to whom the

Lord had promised his kingdom; and affected some surprise that he seemed not to have known that it was written, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God."

² Animals, birds, fishes and insects, frequently combine for attack, or for purposes of defence against a common enemy. Even the elements favor the wisest party. Froude aptly says, — "The winds and waves are on the side of the best navigator — the seaman who best understands them. Place a fool at the helm, and crew and passengers will perish, be they ever so innocent." — *Address on Calvinism*, p. 14.

³ Sir James Mackintosh defines property to be "legal possession."

the object of government. To insure equity and the rights of opinion, are the objects of laws and their administration. We thus find man standing in a two-fold position, — as an individual in his private relations, and as a citizen of the commonwealth or nation, bound to sustain its interests, its laws, and its government in the administration of them.

FORMATION OF PARTIES.

It was a remark of Burke, made in the British Parliament, in his celebrated reply to Fox, on the subject of the French Revolution, "*that he who calls in the aid of an equal understanding doubles his own.*" It is on this simple principle that parties are formed. Men of kindred views, sympathies and interests, join together for the promotion of a common cause. It may be from motives of ambition, to reach a position of power;¹ from mercenary considerations, or from a profound sense of public duty. It may relate to subjects of science, schemes of interest, or the great themes of religion, or of government. As government is the practical business of to-day, and of all time, — and while reformers propose to modify its organization, the laws or the mode of their administration, it is constantly exercising its power and authority, — generally there can be but two great political parties, the one in possession of the legal prerogatives of government, and the other opposed to the continuance of the ruling dynasty. The reasons for this are obvious. The people can have at the same time but one government; and if a party were to subdivide on questions of minor importance, it would fail to command sufficient strength ever to be placed in power. The struggle, therefore, is constantly and chiefly between those who conduct and favor the administration of government in accordance with certain avowed principles, and those who claim a superior rule in a different or in an opposite policy.²

¹ It is said that when it was known that a breach between Fox and Burke must occur, Sheridan wrote a short note to Carleton House for instructions. "Follow Fox," was the laconic reply.

² "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." — Mat. 12: 30.

This principle is too obvious to need much elucidation. "Those who stand neuter," says an old writer (1778), "are neither preferred nor trusted, by reason that one of the parties is always in power, and has nothing more at heart than the advancing of its friends, or gaining some of its adver-

saries. Consequently there can be no posts or offices for men from whom the prevailing party can expect no manner of service. Moreover, how can a man be neuter between two parties, each of whom represent their adversaries as designing those evils which are most apt to fill men with fears — I mean, the destruction of the religion they profess, and the dissolution of a government which alone, in their opinion, can render subjects happy? A man must be insensible, not to be moved with such dangers, when convinced of their reality." — *Dis. on Rise, Progress, &c., Whigs and Tories, &c.* Pamphlet, p. 69.

It is true, other parties will occasionally rise up; but they usually come from the varying ranks of moral reformers, and seek to ingraft some new feature on the general system, with a total disregard of theoretic harmony, or the teachings of practical experience. As their objects are partial or limited, prospective or impracticable, their position is usually one of remote influence, but not of control.¹

In all ages parties have been viewed as indispensable to intelligent existence. The sublime conceptions of Milton have opened to the wondering gaze of man the dread portals of heaven, where the King of kings is braved by rebellious angels. "The wisdom of God," said John Knox, "compelled the very malice of Satan, and such as were drowned in sin, to serve to his glory, and to the profit of his elect." The pious monarchs of the Crusades, who had sufficient zeal to leave their kingdoms to aid in the sublime work of redeeming the holy sepulchre, could not labor together in harmony even upon the spot where the Prince of Peace was crucified.

Cortés found parties in ancient Mexico. "As he proceeded in his enterprise, he clearly perceived," says Prof. Smyth, "that, though he had a powerful monarch and an immense empire to oppose in Montezuma and Mexico, still that he should find allies as he went along, and that, therefore, success was at least not impossible." "It was with the greatest pleasure," said Cortés, "that I saw their dissensions and animosities, for a way was thus opened me for their subjection. According to the proverb, 'From the mountain proceeds what burns the mountain;' and 'the kingdom,' says the Gospel, 'that is divided against itself, cannot stand.'" In the visions of God, Ezekiel is commanded to prophesy against Jerusalem, against the prophets and shepherds of Israel, against Pharaoh, against Gog, the land of Magog and against the Ammonites.

The mythological gods of the ancients had their divisions, wars and revolutions. In Homer a scene is described, of men, heroes and gods, mixed together in battle. The voice of Mars, the terrific shouts of the fight, the thunders of Jupiter, and the tempests of Neptune, combined to shake the whole battle-field, and the tops of the surrounding mountains. Even Pluto

"Robespierre" says Lamartine, "was not had its desired effect, foresaw all the of no party, but of all parties which in their inconveniences that would arise from it, turn served his ideal of the Revolution." though they kept their thoughts to themselves till they discovered the issue. Nay, Whatever he may have professed, he had there is nothing more usual than for some occasion for spies.

¹ Addison speaks of a very considerable of these wise men, who applauded public class of politicians in England—which he measures before they were put in thinks are entitled to notice: He says,— execution, to condemn them upon their "These are such as we may call the *After-* proving unsuccessful."—*Freeholder*, No. wise, who, when any project fails, or hath 53, p. 286.

himself, "whose habitation was in the very centre of the earth, was so affrighted at the shock that he leapt from his throne."¹

RELIGION PROMOTED BY PARTIES.

In regard to the momentous subject of religion, in all countries where freedom of opinion is tolerated, parties are numerous, and doctrines still more so.² Christianity is the only system of religion, it is asserted by Kliefoth, which has what can be called doctrines.³ Mahometanism has its Koran; but the Koran is the book of no sect, and has but one interpretation. The Hindoos have their Vedas; but, as these books are written in the Sanscrit, which is now a dead language, and only understood by the priests or brahmins, they are subject entirely to their control. The ancient Greeks and Romans had their mythologies; but they spoke one language, which admitted of no diversity of construction.⁴ Plato did not speculate upon the

¹ See Addison's Spectator, No. 333. "The term Mythology," says Prof. Park, "was first applied to the Greek and Roman systems of fables, or Classic Mythology; but it has since been extended to those of heathen nations generally. The Romans borrowed their system from the Greeks; and it is now well ascertained that the Greeks derived theirs from the Egyptians and Phœnicians. All these systems, as also those of the Persians, Hindoos, Boodhists, Scandinavians, and American Indians, alike bear traces of the Scripture History, and the ancient religion of the patriarchs; from which, doubtless, they have all been derived, with various degrees of corruption." — *Pantology*, p. 129.

² "The parties affected are innumerable almost, and scattered over the face of the earth, far and near; and so have been in all precedent ages, from the beginning of the world to these times, of all sorts and conditions." This was the language of Robert Burton, two hundred and seventy years ago. — *Anat. Mel.*, Vol. II., p. 487.

"I am about to report a curious fact," says Arago, in his autobiography, "and one which shows that politics, which insinuate themselves and bring discord into the bosom of the most united families, had succeeded,

strange to say, in penetrating as far as the galley-slaves' prison at Algiers. The slaves belonged to three nations; there were in 1809 in this prison, Portuguese, Neapolitans, and Sicilians; among these two latter classes were counted partisans of Murat and those of Ferdinand of Naples. One day, at the beginning of the year, a dragoman came in the name of the Dey to beg M. Dubois-Thainville to go without delay to the prison, where the friends of the French and their adversaries had involved themselves in a furious combat; and already several had fallen. The weapon with which they struck each other was the heavy long chain, attached to their legs." — *Prof. Henry's Report*. — 1870.

³ Neander, in his History of the Church, has shown how the doctrinal questions which agitated the church of the first centuries were quite different from those discussed in the middle ages; the former being mostly theological, and the latter anthropological.

⁴ All polytheistic systems of Religion recognize some representative of the divine principle — which the Christian sees only in the Supreme Being. In the course of time the sun, the planets, the elements, idols

gods, nor upon the articles of the Grecian faith. The state religion of the Chinese does not consist of doctrines, which are to be taught, learned and

and beasts, the sources of good and evil, the human passions, the moral virtues, heroes, benefactors and even destroyers of mankind—have been deified, as gods or demigods, and made objects of adoration. This subject has been so happily presented by Gibbon, that the cursory reader might be led to regard polytheism as favorable to universal toleration. In speaking of the Roman Empire in its greatness, he says, — “The policy of the emperors and the senate, as far as it concerned religion, was happily seconded by the reflections of the enlightened, and by the habits of the superstitious part of their subjects. The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful. And thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord.

The superstition of the people was not imbittered by any mixture of theological rancor; nor was it confined by the chains of any speculative system. The devout polytheist, though fondly attached to his national rites, admitted with implicit faith the different religions of the earth. Fear, gratitude, and curiosity, a dream or an omen, a singular disorder or a distant journey, perpetually disposed him to multiply the articles of his belief, and to enlarge the list of his protectors.

The thin texture of the Pagan mythology was interwoven with various, but not discordant materials. As soon as it was allowed that sages and heroes, who had lived or who had died for the benefit of their country, were exalted to a state of power or immortality, it was universally confessed that they deserved, if not the adoration, at least the reverence of all mankind. The deities of a thousand groves and a thousand streams possessed, in peace, their local and

respective influence; nor could the Roman who deprecated the wrath of the Tiber deride the Egyptian who presented his offering to the beneficent genius of the Nile. The visible powers of Nature, the planets, and the elements, were the same throughout the universe. The invisible governors of the moral world were inevitably cast in a similar mould of fiction and allegory. Every virtue, and even vice, acquired its divine representative; every art and profession its patron, whose attributes, in the most distant ages and countries, were uniformly derived from the character of their peculiar votaries. A republic of gods of such opposite tempers and interests required, in every system, the moderating hand of a supreme magistrate, who, by the progress of knowledge and flattery, was gradually invested with the sublime perfections of an Eternal Parent and an Omnipotent Monarch.

Such was the mild spirit of antiquity, that the nations were less attentive to the difference, than to the resemblance of their religious worship. The Greek, the Roman, and the Barbarian, as they met before their respective altars, easily persuaded themselves that, under various names and with various ceremonies, they adored the same deities. The elegant mythology of Homer gave a beautiful, and almost a regular form to the polytheism of the ancient world.” — *Rom. Empire, Vol. I, pp. 165, 166.*

Humanity was the same then as now in its diversity, — but freedom had not asserted the high dignity and responsibility of individuality. The masses thought with a common opinion, obeyed a general impulse, and looked upon mind as external to themselves.

“Individual vigor and manifold diversity,” says Baron Humboldt, “combine themselves in *originality*; and hence, that on which the consummate grandeur of our na-

believed, but of rites and ceremonies; and its ritual is contained in the statistics and code of the empire.¹ What is asserted of these nations may be said in respect to the Zendavesta of Persia, and of the sacred teachings of all pagan countries, where governments claim a sacred origin, and where mysteries control the religious affections of the people.²

But it is not so in Christian nations, where the Bible is free, and opened to all in their native language. The sublime injunction of Christ, to preach the gospel to the heathen of every land, has been more or less practised in almost every age. From the earliest periods of the Christian era to the present time, history has recorded numerous examples of extraordinary sacrifices to obey the holy requisition.³ We have only to look at the charts

ture ultimately depends,—that towards which every human being must ceaselessly direct his efforts, and on which especially those who design to influence their fellow-men must ever keep their eyes, is the *Individuality of Power and Development*.—*Duties and Sphere of Government*, p. 13.

¹ When a Chinese is asked how many systems of philosophic or religious belief exist in his country, he answers, *Three*—namely, *Yu*, the doctrine of Confucius; *Fo*, or Buddhism; and the sect of *Taou*, or “Rationalists.” Confucianism is the state religion of China.—*Davis’ China*, Vol. II, p. 79.

² “History shows us,” says Baron Humboldt, “that all States have thought fit to avail themselves of this source (religion) of influence, but with very different designs, and in very different degrees. In the ancient nations it was perfectly interwoven with the political constitution,—it was in fact, a grand guiding principle and essential pillar of the State organism; and hence all that I have observed of similar ancient institutions, applies no less aptly to religion. When the Christian religion, instead of the earlier local deities of nations, taught men to believe in a universal God of humanity, thereby throwing down one of the most dangerous barriers which sundered the different tribes of the great human family from each other;—and when it thus succeeded in laying the foundation for all true human virtue, human development and human union, without which, enlightenment and even

science and learning would have long, and perhaps always, remained the rare property of a few;—it also directly operated to loosen the strong bond of connexion that of old existed between religion and the political constitution. But when, afterward, the incursion of the barbarian tribes had scared enlightenment away;—when a misconception of that very religion inspired a blind and intolerant rage for proselytism; and when, at the same time, the political form of States underwent such changes, that citizens were transferred into subjects, and these not so much the subjects of the State as of the person in whom the government was vested;—the solicitude for religion, its preservation and extension, was left to the conscientiousness of princes who believed it confided to their hands by God himself. In our times this prejudice has, comparatively, ceased to prevail; but the promotion of religion by laws and State institutions has been no less urgently recommended by considerations of internal security, and of morality, its strongest bulwark.”—*Duties and Sphere of Government*, pp. 72, 73.

³ “When the idea formed of divinity is the fruit of true spiritual culture,” says Baron Humboldt, “its intimate re-action on the inner perfection is at once beneficial and beautiful. All things assume a new form and meaning in our eyes when regarded as the creatures of fore-casting design, and not the capricious handiwork of unrea-

of the various missionary institutions of modern times, to see that, however much the sects may differ among themselves, they all agree in the common duty of extending the great blessings of Christianity.¹ In the contemplation of the infinite theme of man's religious nature and duties, it would be presumption to limit investigation, or to impose upon a single sect the labors which all sects are appointed to accomplish.² The field is the WORLD, and

soning chance. The ideas of wisdom, order, and adaptive forethought, — ideas so necessary to the conduct of our own actions, and even to the culture of the intellect, strike deeper root into our susceptible nature, when we discover them everywhere around us. The finite becomes as it were infinite; the perishable, enduring; the fleeting, stable; the complex, simple; — when we contemplate one great regulating cause on the summit of things, and regard what is spiritual as endlessly enduring. Our search after truth, our striving after perfection, gain greater certainty and consistency when we can believe in the existence of a Being who is at once the source of all truth, and the sum of all perfection." — *Duties and Sphere of Government*, pp. 76, 77.

¹ NUMBER OF AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETIES, (Protestant), — 17; No. Missionaries, 435; Male Assistants, 28; Female Helpers, 479; Ordained native Preachers, 223; Unordained native Preachers and Catechists, 722; Other native Helpers, 1,352; Members of Churches, 59,062; Pupils in Schools, 40,629; Income, \$1,570,245.

NUMBER OF EUROPEAN SOCIETIES, (Protestant), — 41; No. of Missionaries, 1,638; Male Assistants, 208; Female Helpers, 1,788; Ordained native Preachers, 339; Unordained native Preachers and Catechists, 2,668; Other native Helpers, 6,392; Members of Churches, 242,020; Pupils in Schools, 248,836. Income, about £1,123,871. We have no means of knowing the number of Catholic Missionaries, but it must be very great.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY, instituted in 1816, and has 2,147 AUXILIARIES. Number of Bible Societies in the world, estab-

lished from 1804–1871, 84. Total number of Bibles and Testaments distributed by all from 1804–1871, 105,000,000. Of these 213 *Languages or Dialects*, the translation, printing or distribution of the Scriptures, in whole or in part, has been promoted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. 87,000 Bibles have been distributed in China. Directly, in 146 *Languages or Dialects*; Indirectly, 47 *Languages or Dialects*. Total, 193.

The number of *Versions* (omitting those which are printed in different characters only) is 252. Of these 205 are versions prepared since the year 1804. Receipts of Am. Bib. Soc. to 1871, \$14,128,286.70.

² The statistics of religion for the United States, just completed at the Census Office, show the total number of church organizations on the first of June, 1870, to have been 72,451; total number of church edifices, 63,074; total church accommodation, 21,659,562, and the aggregate value of church property, \$354,429,581. The statistics of church accommodation for the principal denominations are as follows: Baptist, regular, 8,997,116; Baptist, other than regular, 868,019; Roman Catholic, 1,990,514; Congregational, 1,117,212; Episcopal, 991,051; Lutheran, 997,832; Methodist, 6,528,209; Presbyterian, regular, 2,198,900; Presbyterian, other than regular, 499,344; value of the church property owned by these denominations is: Baptist, regular, \$39,229,221; Baptist, other than regular, \$2,378,977; Roman Catholic, \$60,985,566; Congregational, \$25,069,698; Episcopal, \$36,514,549; Lutheran, \$14,917,747; Methodist, \$69,854,121; Presbyterian, regular, \$47,828,732; Presbyterian, other than regular, \$5,436,524.

each sect represents but a single laborer, appointed to do a special work in the great cause of humanity. So vast a subject, of such infinite relations, may well command the holy zeal and activity of a thousand parties, and each to render service alike important, though unlike that of others. The fountain of eternal truth is inexhaustible, and its waters will gush forth to slake the thirst of every people, approaching the living stream, from every clime.

SCIENCE ADVANCED BY PARTIES.

To the concentrated powers of party may be traced many of the most important advancements of science. In all ages of ignorance, the possession of genius has been viewed either as a supernatural gift, and classed with the mysteries of superstition, or as treason to the state. The jealousy of unenlightened power burns with an unquenchable intensity. It crushes all that it cannot control. It strikes down what it cannot understand. It is blinded by new lights, and dismayed by the increase of knowledge. It has no conception of life, except in the means of death; no confidence in truth beyond the fetters and cells of a loathsome prison. It perjured the soul of Copernicus,¹ administered hemlock to Socrates,² shed the blood of Seneca,³ paralyzed the tongue of Galileo,⁴ and banished Aristotle.⁵

In the absence of despotism, where the will of the people is subjected to the control of ignorance and superstition,—where tradition and zeal unite the passions, and give to prejudice the high prerogatives of judgment,—men of

¹ Copernicus, the astronomer, lived in the beginning of the 16th century. His system was looked upon as a most dangerous heresy.

² Socrates, a native of Athens, was pronounced by the oracle at Delphi the wisest of mankind. He was accused of corrupting the Athenian youth, of making innovations in the religion of the Greeks, and was summoned before the tribunal of the five hundred. He was condemned by a majority of three voices, to drink hemlock. He died 400 years B. C., in the 70th year of his age.

³ Seneca, the philosopher, was the early preceptor of Nero. He was mentioned as being concerned in the conspiracy of Piso, when Nero was emperor, and he was ordered to choose the means and destroy himself. He bled himself to death.

⁴ Galileo was twice brought before the Inquisition. The first time, a council of seven cardinals pronounced a sentence, "That to maintain the sun to be immovable, and without local motion, in the centre of the world, is an absurd proposition,—false in philosophy, heretical in religion, and contrary to the testimony of Scripture. That it is equally absurd and false in philosophy to assert that the earth is not immovable in the centre of the world; and, considered theologically, equally erroneous and heretical." Under a threat of imprisonment, he retracted his opinions; but he could not suppress the truth. In 1616, and 1633, he was brought before the Inquisition, and forced solemnly to disavow his own convictions. He died in 1639.

⁵ Although the accusations against Aris-

science have been made the victims of relentless opposition and malignant speculations. Harvey¹ lost his living; Jenner² was a blasphemer; Pascal³ was a heretic; Acosta,⁴ an atheist; Dr. Faustus, a co-partner of Satan; Fulton was the subject of ridicule; and all anatomists who engaged in the business of dissection were denounced as guilty of sacrilege.⁵ Even as late as the year 1598, Daniel Hoffman, Professor of Divinity of the University of Helmstadt, maintained that philosophy was the mortal enemy of religion; that truth was divisible into two branches, — the one *philosophical*, the other *theological*; and that what was *true* in philosophy was *false* in theology.

All systems of philosophy denounced as erroneous or heretical, true or unsafe, immediately become subjects of attention among the people, and of earnest thought and discussion among thinking men and professors. Fired by pride and ambition, or impelled by blind devotion to time-honored theo-

tole were frivolous, yet he was condemned, and only escaped punishment by a voluntary banishment. "I am not willing," said he, "to give the Athenians an occasion of being guilty of injustice a second time against philosophy," — alluding, doubtless, to the case of Socrates.

¹ In 1619, William Harvey, an English physician, published his important work on the circulation of the blood. It was powerfully opposed, for some time; but Harvey lived to see his doctrine fully established. The people, however, were so prejudiced against his theory, that they refused to employ him as a physician.

² Dr. Jenner made the first experiment in vaccination, by transferring the *pus* from the pustule of a milk-maid, who had caught the cow-pox from the cows, to a healthy child, in May, 1796. He published the result in 1799. In 1802, the British Parliament voted £10,000 to Dr. Jenner, for the discovery. Although regarded by many as an impious attempt to oppose the decrees of Divine Providence, vaccination was practised throughout all Europe prior to 1816.

³ Pascal was attacked by Father Noel, the Rector of the Jesuits' College, at Paris, on account of his pneumatic experiments, as if guilty of a very alarming heresy. This was in 1647.

⁴ Acosta, the celebrated Spanish author, was the first philosopher who endeavored to account for the different degrees of heat in the old and new continents by the agency of the winds which blow in each, — a theory which was afterward adopted by Buffon. In the course of these discussions, Acosta frequently comments upon the opinion of Aristotle, and other ancient philosophers, that the middle zone of the earth was so much scorched by the rays of the sun as to be destitute of moisture, and totally uninhabitable. This notion seems to have held its ground in the schools even after the discovery of South America had disclosed the magnificent scenery and stupendous rivers of the tropical regions. It appears to have been thought a sort of impiety to question a dogma of such ancient date, and sanctioned by the assent of all the school divines. The exposing of this ancient error in geography was one of the circumstances which brought upon Sir Walter Raleigh the charge of general scepticism and atheism.

⁵ The dissection of dead bodies was, at no very late period, looked on as sacrilege; and the Emperor Charles V. ordered a consultation of the theologians of Salamanca, to determine whether, in point of conscience, a body might be dissected in order to obtain a knowledge of its structure.

ries, the disputants proclaim their positions, and commence the war of controversy. The lines of party are drawn, with a brilliant display of spirit engendered by the contest, and each division has its champions and followers.

In whatever degree the controversy becomes marked by reason or intelligence, by superstitious bigotry or ignorance, it assumes the character of a scientific investigation, or falls to the level of a bitter conflict of passion and incoherent declamation of opinions. Struggles for victory are always in proportion to the means employed, compared with the power to be opposed. The spirit of truth is clothed with the invincible powers of conscience and knowledge. Weakness in numbers is supplied by irrepressible resolution, ignorant men become violent, and fanatics desperate; and, as ultimate victory is ever on the side of truth, the result conforms to the immutable laws of Providence. Adaptation of natural means to legitimate ends, of efficient remedies to existing evils, is a fundamental law of God.

As in the physical world it requires a brilliant light to dispel a midnight darkness, — so, in the moral, it requires the intellect of a Bacon to assert the dignity of learning, the patriotism of Washington to triumph in the great cause of freedom, and the divine attributes of Christ to lift up and cheer a sinful world. The condition of want and the corresponding necessity of means constitute the measure of the work to be accomplished.

To meet with opposition in the prosecution of a good cause, to be persecuted for devotion to God or duty, to be denounced or banished for patriotism, or a fearless declaration of truth, — quickens all the energies of the soul, ennobles its aims, enlarges the resources of moral strength, and advances an ordinary courage to a holy and unconquerable resolution. Men speak their convictions with a livelier interest and stronger hope; they enlist others to join their strength and enthusiasm; they perfect their knowledge, they master their subject, they improve their means of persuasion, from a passionate sense of duty, and a deep concern for those who still mysteriously claim it as a privilege to be left in a state of mental destitution.

Turning to the great departments of law¹ and medicine,² we there find that reforms are chiefly made by the spirit of party. A desire for improvement is the natural spirit of an active mind; but this is opposed by the

¹ A very able article upon the abstract and historical schools, from the pen of Legaré, may be found in the New York Review, Vol. V, p. 280. been very numerous. The dogmatic, empiric, methodic, eclectic, pneumatic, mechanistic, dynamic, &c., &c., to say nothing of those of modern times, chiefly classed as

² The Medical Schools, or sects, have Allopathic and Homœopathic.

lovers of rest from labor, and by those who claim an exemption from the responsibility of doubting theories of the past.¹

The rivalry of genius in the study of the fine arts is another element of nature akin to party spirit. Each of the great masters has his own style of composition, or beauty, — and each has his followers, throughout the civilized world.

It is only necessary to read the history of such men as Donatello, Roubilliac, Michael Angelo, Rubens, Peter Mignard, Le Brun, Mozart, Rossini, Beethoven, Gluck, Haydn, Handel, and other celebrated sculptors, painters and composers of music, to be convinced of the great influence exerted by the spirit of emulation among artists.

PARTY ACTION, AND ITS IMPORTANCE.

However much the analysis of human motives may be varied, and however they may be combined with the passions, and traced to their ultimate results in action, the greatest activity will invariably be found springing from considerations and feelings linked with the opinions or labors of others. There is but little excitement within ourselves. We are made for society. The idea of an isolated abstraction of personality would be an incomprehensible proposition. We cannot think of ourselves, and, at the same time, exclude all thought of others.

All thoughts, acts and language, indicate an actual mutuality, relationship or antagonism. Men live to agree, to oppose, or to compete. They may be actuated by the debasing motives of rebellion to the rule of right, or lifted up by elevating aspirations after surpassing excellence. They have their preferences, jealousies, prejudices and antipathies.

As men combine for intellectual action, there is an accumulative aggregate of passions which give an element to a mass, which cannot be discovered in the individual. As the snow-flake is to the avalanche, or the drop to the

¹ The expeditions of discovery made by Prince Henry, son of John, King of Portugal, excited the inveterate prejudices of his countrymen. The systematic philosophers were alarmed lest their favorite theories should be perverted by the acquisition of real knowledge. The military beheld with impatience the increase of fame that was obtained by a profession they had always considered as inferior to their own; the nobility dreaded opening a source of wealth which might equalize the ascendancy of rank; and the indolent and splenetic argued that it was presumption to search for a passage to the southern extremity of Africa, which the wisest geographers had pronounced to be impracticable. It was even hinted, as a probable consequence, that the mariners, after passing certain latitude, would be changed into blacks, and thus retain forever a disgraceful mark of their temerity. — *Clark's Progress of Maritime Discovery.*

uphevings of the mighty ocean, so is man to the multitude, combined by the sympathies of motive and interest.¹ The passions constitute the moving energies of the soul. They are life to mind, and activity to purpose. They impart energy to thought. What air, fire and water, are to machinery, the passions are to intellect. Their mission is a high and mighty one, though their perversions are terrible. The excess of each is fearfully added to the excess of all. Look to the extravagant pleasures of the imagination, the bright promises of hope, the joyous throngs of sentiment, which cluster and cling to every new-born thought, whatever cause it comes to help; the pure and unaffected grace of conscience, the glowing love and uncompromising spirit of truth and justice, the lightning zeal of patriotism,—all conspire to move a people in the achievement of a common good, with irresistible impetuosity.

Then, turn to the opposite extreme, where tyranny rules and liberty weeps in chains; where misnamed justice is but the beast in robes, and religion wears a crown of thorns; where truth is heresy, and love is treason; where hate is joined to malice, cruelty to fear, and outrage to force,—there is found an array of elements more fearful than the throes of earth, or the upliftings of the sea.

Such are the mighty forces of party. Mind opposed to mind, passion to passion, zeal to zeal, and force to force. It is the war of life against death, truth against error, virtue against vice, love against sin, and of patriotism in the defence and extension of freedom and equal rights. To disclaim its necessity is a perversion of knowledge, and to deny its power a confession of ignorance. Like all other great instruments of good, party spirit commits its ignoble deeds, and in its excessive sway often tramples down the flowers which grow in the battle-field. Like the tornado, it sometimes leaves desolation in its track, and the joys of social or domestic life are withered by its blighting breath. But great powers are the instruments of great events.

¹ This community of feeling may be regarded as the special and extraordinary workings of the mind in common. All the great interests of society have been, at different periods, the subjects of it. Society and nations have been advanced by revolutions, the crusades and chivalry; the sciences, by the superstitions of astrology and the wild dreams of alchemists and the thousands of speculations, which were significantly termed, in the early part of the eighteenth century, "*bubbles*," and which

have tended to mark a distinct and perceptible line between the practicable and impracticable objects of industry; oftentimes promoting the public good at the expense of individual folly, sacrifice and extravagance. These bubbles were so numerous in the time of Geo. I. (1720) that the interference of Parliament became necessary; and the king published a proclamation declaring them to be "unlawful and common nuisances," and five hundred pounds was made the penalty for buying or selling a share in any of them. — *Parl. Deb.* Vol. VII, p. 654.

"Turned nothing into all things,"

They are fitted to remove great evils, or to accomplish immeasurable good. They belong to humanity, destined to infinite progression, and not to the ephemeral period of individual existence. They may, indeed, disturb the hour, but bless the generation; or they may break the circle, yet save the nation.¹

If the value of blessings were measured according to the degrees of their abuse, or susceptibility to danger in the misapplication of principles, we should soon arrive at the startling conclusion, that power does not belong to the condition of man, and that all action is but another term for danger. Such views come from an imperfect moral vision. They are the offspring of ill-balanced or debilitated minds. They are false to the true dignity of man. They mistrust his nature, his destiny, and the reign of his Creator. They indicate a slothful selfishness, which would reduce the plans of infinite wisdom to the insignificant sphere of individual timidity, or sickly passiveness.

Thus a general survey has been taken of the principles involved in the subject of this work. This course seemed to be particularly necessary, inasmuch as there are many men, of unexceptionable character, who do not appear fully to appreciate the necessity, as well as the great importance, of party.² Some, indeed, claim distinction for a stoic indifference to public

¹ Washington, in his Farewell Address, in speaking of party spirit, says it "is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy." — *Sparks's Washington*, Vol. XII, p. 224. He condemned the excesses of party spirit, but admitted the necessity of party. — See his Letter to Hamilton, *ib.* Vol. I, p. 476.

Franklin came to the conclusion, as early as in 1731, "That the great affairs of the world, the wars and revolutions, are carried on and effected by parties;" and he proposed to organize a new party, to be called the "UNITED Party for Virtue." — *Sparks's Franklin*, Vol. I, p. 118.

Madison says, "An extinction of parties necessarily implies either a universal alarm for the public safety, or an absolute extinction of liberty." — *Federalist*, p. 828.

² Lord Chatham, in his earlier days, declaimed against party distinctions, and refused to be known as a member of either party; but, as he increased in experience, he reversed this opinion. As he saw more clearly the practical working of the constitution, he became convinced of the necessity of party connections in a free country; and, during the latter years of his life, he was frequent and energetic in his declarations that he was a democrat. In a debate in the House of Lords, on the seizure of Falkland's Island, 1770, Lord Chatham closed an eloquent speech in the following language: "I know I shall be accused of attempting to revive distinctions. — My Lords, if it were possible, I would abolish all distinctions. I would not wish the favors of the crown to flow invariably in one channel. But there are some distinctions which are inherent in the nature of things. There is a distinction between right and wrong — between WHIG and TORY." — *Chat. Cor.*, Vol. IV, p. 17.

affairs, and an honorable name for the negative virtue of neutrality.¹ Such views may be in harmony with the hermit's remorse, or with the Timons of Athens, who

"Hate all, curse all;"

but they dishonor the man who claims to be a citizen, and loves the service of his country. Some labor hard to acquire knowledge, but never use it. They are influenced by opinions, and oftener by prejudices. Some study the mind, and the nature of society, — as if they neither possessed the one nor belonged to the other. They affect a useless independence, as if they wanted nothing and never would be wanted. He who affects to despise the world and its appointments disparages himself and boasts of his own folly. *Magna est veritas et praevalabit* — is a party maxim that asserts the highest aim and assures the noblest end. As truth pervades time and eternity, and inheres in all that moves in space, and lies hidden in the countless circumstances and conditions of life, and in the thoughts and emotions of the soul as connected with holiness and duty, progress and happiness, — its pursuit will ever command the utmost energies of mind, and never exhaust the unfathomable depths of mental ingenuity, the mysteries of faith, nor the competing trials of party.

Viewed with a careful judgment, the subject is a most sacred one. Clearly to understand the rights of men and the legitimate means of their defence; to guard against culpable neglect, or stolid indifference, in respect to matters of public concern; to resist the encroachments or abuses of power, are the incumbent duties of all who are capable of appreciating the true dignity of principle, and claim an exemption from the conditions of slavery.² The true bearings of the subject, in its diversified relations, cannot be well understood, without some degree of attention to fundamental principles. We have only

¹ Or, as Hume significantly terms it, an "indolent acquiescence in received opinions." Dr. Paley says that, "in political, above all other subjects, the arguments, or rather the conjectures, on each side of a question, are often so equally poised, that the wisest judgments may be held in suspense." These he calls "*subjects of indifference*," which means, if anything, a neutrality characterized by apathy. "To call anything indifferent in religion," says an able writer, "is to own that it has nothing to do with religion." Among the laws of Solon there was one rendering all those infamous who attempted neutrality in times of

public danger. The following lines are taken from a poem, entitled "The Art of Politicks," published in 1729:

"The middle way the best we sometimes call,
But it is in Politicks no way at all.
A Trimmer's what both parties turn to sport,
By country hated, and despised at court."

² It is one of the advantages of free governments, says Sir James Mackintosh, that they excite, sometimes to an inconvenient degree, but, upon the whole, with the utmost benefit, all the generous feelings, all the efforts for a public cause, of which human nature is capable.

glanced at the vast frame-work of the moral edifice of the Creator, as connected with these inquiries; and have briefly attempted to point out the rudiments of the great subject, so that readers may be persuaded to pursue the study for themselves, and do something to develop the momentous theme.

It is not the object of this work to encourage the love of party, to the neglect of other duties. Such a view involves the obvious absurdity of counting the part as greater than the whole. Its purpose is rather to claim for party, in the wide range of human agency, that consideration to which it is justly entitled, by its great importance.

Inquiries will now be directed with more special reference to the object of this work — the history of DEMOCRACY. And yet it remains to be stated in what sense it is intended to employ a term which so long has been used to designate a particular kind of government, or the great party liberally representing the wishes and the interests of the people. As the same party has been known by many different names in different ages, and as party names seldom indicate principles, we shall adopt the designations acknowledged by the two great political parties of England, the DEMOCRATIC and the TORY; and endeavor to show that, though each may vary in the externals of dress, and exhaust the vocabulary of names, it has always been, and still is, relatively and fundamentally the same.

THE TORY PARTY.

The TORY¹ PARTY, represents the conservative principle, as identified with

¹ This party name, "TORY," is derived from "*toringhim*," to pursue for the sake of plunder. — *O'Connor, Bib. Stowensis*, Vol. II, p. 460.

The adherents of Charles the First were called *cavaliers*, and their opponents *round-heads*. In the time of Charles the Second, the former were denominated *tories*, and the latter *whigs*. "The origin of these distinctions is this: At that time a sort of *Irish banditti*, or robbers, who kept in the mountains and isles formed by the vast bogs of that country, were called *tories*, and were known by the name of *rapparees*. As the king's enemies accused him of favoring the *Irish* rebellion, which broke out about that time, they gave his adherents the name of *tories*. These, on the other-hand, to be

even with their enemies, who were closely united with the *Scots*, called them *whigs*, a name of reproach used in Scotland." — *Dissert. on Rise, Progress, Views, &c., of the Whigs and Tories*. Pamphlet, 1773, p. 16.

The democratic party of England is still termed the whig party. There is no good reason why a term of reproach should be substituted for a legitimate word significant of principle. When this term was thrown off by the democrats of America, with a view to return to their proper designation, their opponents assumed the title. It had a democratic origin and reputation, and the advanced Tory Party of the United States became clothed in the antiquated garb of democracy: When alluding, therefore, to

arbitrary power. Arbitrary power anticipates the rule of Providence, and in its assumptions, attempts to foresee and predict the will of God, and to control the will of man. What the centripetal force is to the planet, this principle is to the soul. The party prescribes to itself a narrow circle, and centralizes its objects. It assumes to be the conservator of light, and claims the prerogative of standing between the great source of its rays and the vast multitudes of men upon whom they were made to shine. It holds back, withdraws and turns back, in its policy. It is timid, doubting and selfish. It claims rule in proportion to its knowledge, forgetting that it is blinded by its possession of wealth, and deceived by its inordinate love of power. "It begs the whole question in dispute."¹ Practically it believes that man was made for government, and not government for man. Its adherents have but a faint conception of a community of interests, or of the universality of progress. In their hearts they have a record of brass for every error and excess of liberty, but on their tongues is a sponge to blot out the foulest crimes and blackest treacheries of despotism.² When in power, they stop the great wheels of advancement, as if they were the legatees of a deceased

the whigs of England, we shall designate them as democrats, standing, as they do, in the same relation to the tory party of England as the democrats of America stand to their opponents. In the United States, as in all countries, there are two leading parties; the DEMOCRATIC and the Tory.

In speaking of party names in the United States, in an address delivered in 1842, John Quincy Adams says: "The struggle was long and acrimonious for the name of republicans, assumed by both parties, but claimed as exclusive by one of them; and when Mr. Jefferson had settled that *all* were republicans, his own party, dissatisfied with the decision, cast off the appellation for which they had so steadily contended, and called themselves democrats."

"Were I permitted," continues Mr. Adams, "to select a name for the party to which I should wish to belong, it would be that of constitutionalist." This might do in a country where a monarchy refused a constitution; but in the United States, where all are in favor of one, the term would indicate *union*, rather than party.

The term "*federalist*" could not contin-

ue to represent party principles, when, as Mr. Jefferson said fifty years ago, "*all are federalists*." It implied a false distinction, and was misused by the aristocracy.

"From the time of the adoption of the federal constitution, in 1788," says Judge Hammond, "till about the time of the election of Gen. Jackson, in 1828, the party opposed to the federalists was known as the republican party. For a long time the word *democrat*, or *democratic*, was used as a term of reproach. The republicans were by the federalists called democrats, as synonymous with the word *Jacobin*. And, indeed, it was intended to convey the idea that the republican party, in principle and practice, was nearly allied to the *Jacobinic* clubs of France. On the other hand, the republicans, with a view to cast odium on their opponents, called the federalists *aristocrats*." — *Hammond's Political Hist. of New York*, Vol. I, p. 586.

¹ Sir James Mackintosh, Speech on Reform Bill, Works, Vol. III, p. 558.

² Sheridan's reply to Burke, Parl. Deb., Vol. XXX, p. 395.

nation, instead of being the agents to do the business of its government for the future good of the people. The party is professedly and confidently paternal in its measures, but it admits of no limit to the period of minority. It seeks to exert a perpetual guardianship, that the people may be cared for, but not trusted. It becomes exhausted by its sole reliance on the resources of its artificial and constructive policy, and *divided* on questions of expediency as to means for continuing or re-establishing its strength or ascendancy. The element of rivalry exerts a greater power than its love of harmony for the common good. It is not only false to principle, but faithless to its own men. They are sacrificed to secure a trifling expedient of temporary policy, and present availability in retaining power is prized above a future permanent good.

No man understood the character of the Tory, or described him with more accuracy, than Addison, in the time of Geo. I. He says, "His political faith is altogether founded on hope. He does not give credit to anything because it is probable, but because it is pleasing. His wishes serve him instead of reasons, to confirm the truth of what he hears. There is no report so incredible or contradictory in itself which he doth not cheerfully believe, if it tends to the advancement of the cause. In short, a malecontent,¹ who is a good believer, has generally reason to repeat the celebrated rant of an ancient father, *Credo quia impossibile est*: which is as much as to say, It must be true, because it is impossible.

"It has been well observed, that the most credulous man in the world is the atheist, who believes the universe to be the production of chance. In the same manner, a Tory, who is the greatest believer in what is improbable, is the greatest infidel in what is certain. Let a friend to the government² relate to him a matter of fact, he turns away his ear from him, and gives him the lie in every look. But if one of his own stamp should tell him that the King of Sweden would be suddenly at Perth, and that his army is now actually marching thither upon the ice; he hugs himself at the good news, and gets drunk upon it before he goes to bed. This sort of people puts one in mind of several towns in Europe that are inaccessible on the one side while they lie open, unguarded on the other."³

If it may be permitted to use the expression, without offence, the back of the party is ever turned upon the present and the future. The party dwells on the events of the past; and is so intently fixed in its gaze upon what has been, with a view to the mere reproduction of measures of former times, and without much consideration of the change of circumstances, that it forgets

¹ A tory. See Esther, XIII, 4, 5.

² *Freeholder*, No. 14. See the Tory's

³ The whig party was in power when this CREED—as given by Addison—Appendix A. was written.

to move onward, or to leave the track of power, until crushed by the party engines of their opponents. It has more reverence for the past acts of men than confidence in the government of God vested in the instincts and experience of the people.¹

The mission of the party is not to be denied because we do not yield to its claims, or concede to it the honor of the first position, as to importance, in the advancement of the great interests of humanity. Facts are simply stated, too well authenticated to be doubted by any considerate man who is conversant with the teachings of history.² This negative principle is not peculiar to political organization. It pervades, as has been seen, all the departments of human knowledge, and is ever known by its uniform hostility to most of the new movements of science and of national progress. IF IT EVER SUCCEEDS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT, IT IS BECAUSE IT DEPARTS FROM ITS OWN PRINCIPLES.

Although the party is not characterized by the active elements of progress, all will admit that it serves as a stimulant to increased exertions on the part of its opponents, and to greater thoroughness in the attainments of science. It helps to gain what most it dreads.³ A large portion of its members doubtless act from high considerations of duty, and are seized with conscientious amazement at failures which they cannot comprehend; and we should regret to have our remarks, which are applicable only to constitutional powers and acquired habits of discernment, misapplied to the motives of men. It may be permitted to doubt a man's judgment, and to mistrust his ability to serve

¹ Pulteney (in the time of Geo. II,) was of the opinion "that the trunk of the tree in the government should be formed of democrats, but the tories might be inoculated or ingrafted upon it." — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XII, p. 531.

² When Lord North complained of the misrepresentations of the opposition, he was thus answered by Burke: "He says, that his words have been misrepresented, and his meaning perverted: and I am inclined to believe that, if any meaning at all has been imputed to him, the first part of the charge may be true. His own words have no meaning, and, therefore, their meaning cannot be perverted. If words have been imputed to him that have a meaning, he has certainly suffered wrong, and I hope that gentlemen will for the future be more cautious how they commit such offences against ministers of state." — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XVI, p. 720.

If the tories are misrepresented by any of the language here employed to define their position, the error may find a sufficient explanation in the language of Burke.

³ The principle of conservatism has a defence in the laws of growth. The holding back of reform sometimes gives strength and maturity which can come in no other way so well. On this ground it was that Fox, in alluding to the defeat of the ministers who attempted to crush the American colonies, made the remark "that though he could not thank God for the many calamities which had overtaken the unhappy land in consequence of the fatal system by which the king and people had been deluded, still he considered it as beneficial that the triumph (of the democratic party) had not been sooner." — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XXII, p. 1097.

the public, and to speak of him as a weak and dangerous agent,—as Col. Barré, in the British Parliament, spoke of the conduct of Lord North, in his ministerial capacity, as being “most indecent and scandalous,”¹—while it would be far from the design of any one to impeach his personal integrity, or to question the purity of his private character.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY² represents the great principle of progress. It

¹ This language was highly resented by Lord North. He characterized Col. Barré as “brutal and insolent,” and a great uproar in Parliament was the consequence. He was called to order by the speaker and the opposition, and was required to make an apology. He made two attempts before he succeeded to the satisfaction of Parliament. He finally confessed that “*it was a wonder he should ever lose his temper, considering how often he was obliged to hear hard words applied to him personally.*” “Col. Barré,” said Mr. Townshend, “had attacked the minister on public grounds, and in a warrantable parliamentary manner; yet the minister, a servant of the public and servant of that house, had dared to call an honorable member of that house ‘*insolent and brutal*’, for speaking what he and every other member had a right to say to any one of the king’s ministers.”

Col. Barré expressed great respect for the noble lord as a private gentleman, but claimed a wide distinction between the courtesies of private life and the high responsibilities of a public position. — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. XXII, p. 1048 — (1782).

In speaking of the younger Pitt (1782), Mr. Fox makes the same distinction. He reprehended Mr. Pitt for resting the sincerity of a ministerial declaration on the purity of his own private character. “Such conduct,” said Mr. Fox, “was by no means parliamentary; nor could it in this instance have much weight. His private character had no reproach; but his character was to be tried. *As a minister, he had no character.*” — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. XXIII, p. 276.

² Democracy is compounded of two Greek words, — “*Demos*,” people, and “*Kratos*,” government: The government of the people. It comprehends in principle all that can be demanded for the good of the people. It is a name that can neither be surrendered nor altered.

“Such is the power of the word Democracy,” says Guizot, “that no government or party dares to raise its head, or believes its own existence possible, if it does not bear that word inscribed on its banner; and those who carry that banner aloft with the greatest ostentation and to the extremest limits, believe themselves to be stronger than all the rest of the world.

“This is now (1848) the sovereign and universal word which all parties invoke, all seek to appropriate as a talisman.

“The Monarchists say, ‘Our Monarchy is a Democratic Monarchy: therefore it differs essentially from the ancient monarchy, and is adapted to the modern condition of society.’

“The Republicans say, ‘The Republic is Democracy governing itself. This is the only form of government in harmony with a democratic society, its principles, its sentiments and its interests.’

“Socialists, Communists and Montagnards require that the republic should be a pure and absolute democracy. This, in their estimation, is the condition of their legitimacy.”

If such be the conceded power of the word, by its opponents, what must have been the power of democratic principles to justify the concession. Those who claim the name, and

is onward and outward in its movements. It has a heart for action, and motives for a world. It constitutes the principle of diffusion, and is to humanity what the centrifugal force is to the revolving orbs of a universe. What motion is to them, Democracy is to principle. It is the soul in action. It conforms to the providence of God. It has confidence in man, and an abiding reliance in his high destiny. It seeks the largest liberty, the greatest good, and the surest happiness. It aims to build up the great interests of the many, to the least detriment of the few. It remembers the past, without neglecting the present. It establishes the present, without fearing to provide for the future.¹ It cares for the weak, while it permits no injustice to the strong. It conquers the oppressor, and prepares the subjects of tyranny for freedom.² It melts the bigot's heart to meekness, and reconciles his mind to knowledge. It dispels the clouds of ignorance and superstition, and prepares the people for instruction and self-respect. It adds wisdom to legislation, and improved judgment to government. It favors enterprise that yields a reward to the many, and an industry that is permanent. It is the pioneer of humanity—the conservator of nations. IT FAILS ONLY WHEN IT CEASES TO BE TRUE TO ITSELF. *VOX POPULI EST VOX DEI* has proved to be both a proverb and a prediction.³

It is a mistake to suppose that DEMOCRACY may not be advanced under different forms of government.⁴ Its own, it should be remembered, is the

carry the banner aloft with integrity and sincerity are invincible in the cause of truth.

¹ "Often," says the son of the late Judge Story (whose father was in early life a democrat), "in speaking of this subject (democracy), I have heard him say, 'I like as much to see a young man democratic as an old man conservative. When we are old, we are cautious, and slow of change, if we have benefited by experience. When we are young, we hope too much, if we are generous and pure.'" — *Life and Letters of Judge Story*, Vol. 1, p. 99.

If "hoping too much" is derived from the conditions of purity and generosity—this language is not well chosen. Hope from such a source would be noble aspiration, and deeds would correspond with sentiment. To wish or hope too much, and to make promises on such an excess without regard to experience, and which cannot be fulfilled, is not democratic.

Condorcet, although an aristocrat by

genius and by birth, became a democrat from philosophy. — *Lamartine*.

² "The Champion of Democracy must always either keep in front or be trampled." — *Croly's Life of Burke*.

³ A few years since, a member of the United States Senate sneeringly asked senator Allen, of Ohio, the question, "What is Democracy?" The following was the prompt reply: "Democracy is a sentiment not to be appalled, corrupted or compromised. It knows no baseness; it cowers to no danger; it oppresses no weakness; destructive only of despotism, it is the sole conservator of liberty, labor and property. It is the sentiment of freedom, of equal rights, of equal obligations,—the law of nature pervading the law of the land."

⁴ In the third century—one of the Christian Fathers, in summing up the characteristics of a true Christian, said, in conclusion,— "In fact—to be a true Christian, a man must be a DEMOCRAT."

highest conventional form, that which precedes the lofty independence of the individual spoken of by the apostle to the Hebrews, who will need no government but from the law which the Lord has placed in his heart.¹

In one respect all nations are governed upon the same principle; that is, each adopts the form which it has the understanding and the power to sustain. There is in all a greater and a lesser power, — and it requires no profound speculation to decide which will control. A tyrannical dictator may do more to advance the true interests of democracy than a moderate sovereign who is scrupulously guided by an antiquated constitution; for the tyrant adds vigor to his opponents by his deeds of oppression.²

The frequent question as to what form of government is best, is often answered without any reference to condition or application of principles. There can be properly but one answer, and yet the application of that answer may lead to great diversity of views.

When it is asserted that the democratic form of government is unquestionably the best, it must be considered that the answer not only designates the form preferred, but implies a confident belief in the advanced condition of the people who are to be the subjects of it. It premises the capacity for self-control, and a corresponding degree of knowledge in regard to the rights, balances and necessities, of society. It involves a discriminating appreciation of the varied duties of the man, the citizen and the legislator. It presupposes a reasonable knowledge of the legitimate means and ends of government, enlarged views of humanity, and of the elements of national existence.³

¹ "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." Hebrews 8: 10, 11.

² "It has been observed," says Sir James Mackintosh, "that if the illustrious and long-flourishing republic of the United Provinces erected statues to the authors of its liberty, the first would be due to Cardinal Granvelle, whose tyrannical principles provoked the spirit of resistance, and the second to the Duke of Alva, who attempted to carry Granvelle's principles into effect."

³ "What, sir, is the genius of democ-

racy?" asked Patrick Henry in the Virginia Convention, 1788. "Let me read that clause of the bill of rights of Virginia which relates to this: (*8d clause*) That government is or ought to be instituted for the common benefit, protection and security of the people, nation or community; of all the various modes and forms of government, that is best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against the dangers of mal-administration; and that whenever any government shall be found inadequate, or contrary to those principles, or contrary to those purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal." — *Elliot's Deb.*, Vol. III, p. 77.

The democratic form of government is the best, because its standard of moral requisition is the highest. It claims for man a universality of interest, liberty and justice. It is Christianity, with its mountain beacons and guides.¹ It is the standard of Deity, based in the eternal principles of truth, passing through and rising above the yielding cloud of ignorance, into the regions of infinite wisdom. As we live on, this "pillar of the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night" will not be taken from before the people,² but will stand immovable, immeasurable, and in the brightness of its glory continue to shed increasing light on a world and a universe.

The great objects of knowledge and moral culture of the people are among its most prominent provisions.³ Practical religion and religious freedom are the sunshine of its growth and glory.⁴ It is the sublime and mighty standard spoken of by the Psalmist, who exclaims, in the beautiful language of poetical conception :

*"The Lord is high above all nations, and his glory above the heavens. Who is like unto the Lord our God, who dwelleth on high; who humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven, and in the earth! He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the needy out of the dunghill; that he may set him with princes, even with the princes of the people."*⁵

To say that a man is not in a condition to realize or to appreciate such a standard, is to admit its necessity. To object to its lofty requisitions, is to establish its authority. The standard for a world should be in harmony with the attributes of Deity, above and beyond the present wants of humanity.

To say that an ignorant and immoral people are capable of self-govern-

In the same convention, Judge Marshall said, "What are the favorite maxims of democracy? A strict observance of justice and public faith, and a steady adherence to virtue. These, sir, are the principles of a good government."—*ib.*, VOL. III, p. 223.

¹ "Democracy," says the late Mr. Legaré, in an article published in the New York Review, "in the high and only true sense of that much-abused word, is the destiny of nations, because it is the spirit of Christianity."—VOL. V, p. 297.

"A man's supremacy over his own accidents,"—is a definition that has been given of democracy.

² Ex. 13: 21.

³ "There have been periods," says Lord Brougham, "when the country heard with dismay that 'the soldier was abroad.' That

is not the case now. Let the soldier be ever so much abroad, in the present age, he can do nothing. There is another person abroad; a less important person,—in the eyes of some, an insignificant person,—whose labors have tended to produce this state of things: the schoolmaster is abroad; and I trust more to the schoolmaster, armed with his primer, than I do to the soldier, in his full military array, for upholding and extending the liberties of my country."

⁴ In his chapter on the times of Erasmus and Luther, Froude says,—"The church was essentially democratic, while at the same time it had the monopoly of learning; and all the secular power fell to it which learning combined with sanctity and assisted by superstition, can bestow."

⁵ Ps. 113: 4-6.

ment, is asserting that government may be administered without knowledge and without justice. Such a proposition is admitted by no one, and is, therefore, inadmissible in all discussions as to what form of government is best.¹

Democracy is a permanent element of progress, and is present everywhere, whatever may be the temporary form of the ruling power. Its inextinguishable fires burst forth in an empire, and its welcome lights cheer the dark domains of despotism.² While tyrants hate the patriot, and exile him from their contracted dominions, the spirit of democracy invests him as a missionary of humanity, and inspires him with an eloquence which moves a world. Its lightning rays cannot be hidden,—its presence cannot be banished. Dictators, kings and emperors, are but its servants; and, as man becomes elevated to the dignity of self-knowledge and control, their ministration ceases. Their rule indicates an imperfect state of society, and may be regarded as the moral props of the builder, necessary only to sustain a people in their different periods of growth. One cannot speak of them lightly, nor indulge in language that should seem to deny their fitness as the instruments of good in the hands of Providence. Their true position may be best gathered from the prediction which is based upon a knowledge of the past and present condition of man,—that all kingdoms and empires must cease, whenever a people have a knowledge of their rights, and acquire the power of a practical application of principles. This is the work of time.

¹ When Sicily was taken possession of by Great Britain, the Sicilian government was formed after the model of the British. The result of this experiment is contained in the following quotation from *Travels in Sicily, Greece and Albania*, by Rev. Mr. Hughes:

"No words can describe the scenes which daily occurred, upon the introduction of the representative system in Sicily. The House of Parliament, neither moderated by discretion nor conducted with dignity, bore the resemblance of a receptacle for lunatics, instead of a council-room for legislators; and the disgraceful scenes so often enacted at the hustings in England, were here transferred to the very floor of the senate. As soon as the president had proposed the subject for debate, and restored some degree of order from the confusion of tongues which followed, a system of crimination and recrimination invariably commenced by several

speakers, accompanied with such furious gesticulations and hideous contortions of countenance, such bitter taunts and personal invectives, that blows generally ensued. This was the signal for universal uproar. The president's voice was unheeded and unheard; the whole house arose; partisans of different antagonists mingled in the affray, when the ground was literary covered with combatants, kicking, biting, scratching, and exhibiting all the evolutions of the old Pan-eratic contests. Such a state of things could not be expected to last a long time; indeed, this constitutional synod was dissolved in the very first year of its creation, and martial law established." — VOL. I, pp. 5-7.

This statement, though said to be authentic, bears the marks of prejudice and exaggeration. Results are given with an assumptive statement of causes.

² It is what Lord Bolingbroke denominated

It is the work of constant, repeated trial. The child that attempts to step an hundred times and falls ; the new-fledged bird that tries its feeble wings again and again before it is able to sweep the circle of the sky with its kindred flock, indicate the simple law upon which all strength depends, whether it be the strength of an insect, or the strength of a nation.¹

Because a people do not succeed in changing their form of government, even after repeated trials, we are not to infer that they are indulging in impracticable experiments, nor that they will be disappointed in ultimately realizing the great objects of their ambition. Indeed, all failures of this class are indicative of progressive endeavor. They imply an increasing knowledge of the true dignity of man, and a growing disposition to engage in new and more and more difficult endeavors. These endeavors are but the exercise of a nation, and without them no people can ever command the elements of national existence and of self-control. But inquiries in regard to so extensive a subject should be shaped within more practical limits.

It is not a little remarkable that while democratic principles have been recognized, more or less, during all ages of the world, intelligent thinkers approach the inquiry respecting the tendencies of democracy as if its mission were of recent origin, and its blessings of a questionable nature.

"It was a curious spectacle," says Montesquieu, "to behold the vain efforts of the English to establish among themselves a democracy."

In a letter to Lord Sheffield, Aug. 1792, Gibbon says, — "The terrors which might have driven me hence (France) have in a great measure subsided ; our state-prisoners are forgotten : the country begins to recover its old good-humor and unsuspecting confidence, and the last revolution of Paris appears to have convinced everybody of the fatal consequences of democratic principles, which lead by a path of flowers into the abyss of hell."

In these extracts an Englishman speaks of democracy in France, and a

"*the spirit of liberty*," in contradistinction
 "to *the spirit of dominion*."

¹ This great truth is beautifully acknowledged by Humboldt. He says, — "If even to behold a people breaking their fetters asunder, in the full consciousness of their rights as men and citizens, is a beautiful and ennobling spectacle: it must be still more fair, and full of uplifting hope, to witness a prince himself unloosing the bonds of thralldom and granting freedom to his people, — nor this as the mere bounty of his gracious condescension, but as the discharge

of his first and most indispensable duty ; for it is nobler to see an object effected through a reverent regard for law and order, than conceded to the imperious demands of absolute necessity ; and the more so when we consider that the freedom which a nation strives to attain through the overthrow of existing institutions, is but as hope to enjoyment, as preparation to perfection, when compared with that which a State, once constituted, can bestow." — *Sphere and Duties of Government*, p. 5.

Frenchman of democracy in England, but with no defined ideas upon the subject. Both evidently use the word as signifying a wild enthusiasm that fascinates the common mind with its utopian promises, and employ it to designate a revolutionary process of popularizing the form or the administration of the government. Fanaticism is not democracy, nor is democracy the spirit of revolution. Excess of any kind does not make a part of its definition. What more gentle than the playful zephyr upon the Æolian Lyre, or more terrible than the roaring tornado rushing in its fury over the fair face of nature, and yet, both are produced by the same cause, modified only in degree. So of man. The faculties and passions of the soul that combine in their activity to form the noblest and loveliest characters, when chafed by wrong, or stung by insult and centred in the common multitude and directed by the voice of phrensy,—produce a storm of terror mingled with detestation, infinitely more frightful than the dark and devastating gusts and whirls of elemental war. The natural agents most employed to bless mankind, when perverted or undirected, often become the instrumentalities of the greatest evils. While science cannot be made responsible for the violences or excesses of nature, it is unreasonable to hold democracy as accountable for the excesses of mind. It neither seeks to produce them, nor willingly yields to their sway.

Equal rights, when considered in relation to the wants and condition of the people, is but another term for universal justice, demanding the nicest discrimination of principles, and the most careful adjustment of interests. The standard of democracy, the government of the people, can permit no redundancy of privilege, nor inequality of benefit. So far as possible, all must be served alike, whether to enjoy or to suffer. Democracy is strictly a science of government, and “it aims, like other sciences, at truth, and advances, *pari passu*, with its developments.” More than this, it is a system of government based upon common sense, strictly adapted to the wants and condition of the people. It is simple, plain, economical, comprehensive and just. Any excess, that favors or injures any one, or any class, that can be avoided, is not only a special evil, but a general calamity. It is anti-democratic. The abuses of democracy is quite another subject, for it is an old proverb that “the best things when abused become the worst.”

De Tocqueville, with his deep sensibility and characteristic sincerity, approaches the subject with sentiments of mingled awe and reverence. He cannot doubt the teachings of history, and yet he trembles when he attempts to draw a line between the errors of man and the will of God. He sees the problems of the past as solved by Providence,—but he is bewildered by the fearful problems of the present, when philosophy assumes to speak the language of prophecy.

He says, — “ If we examine what has happened in France at intervals of fifty years, beginning with the eleventh century, we shall invariably perceive that a twofold revolution has taken place in the state of society. The noble has gone down on the social ladder, and the *roturier* has gone up ; the one descends as the other rises. Every half-century brings them nearer to each other, and they will very shortly meet.

“ Nor is this phenomenon at all peculiar to France. Whithersoever we turn our eyes we shall witness the same continual revolution throughout the whole of Christendom.

“ The various occurrences of national existence have everywhere turned to the advantage of democracy ; all men have aided it by their exertions ; those who have intentionally labored in its cause, and those who have served it unwittingly ; those who have fought for it, and those who have declared themselves its opponents, — have all been driven along in the same track, have all labored to one end, some ignorantly and some unwillingly ; all have been blind instruments in the hands of God.

“ The gradual development of the equality of conditions is, therefore, a providential fact, and it possesses all the characteristics of a Divine decree : it is universal, it is durable, it constantly eludes all human interference ; and all events, as well as all men, contribute to its progress.

“ Would it, then, be wise to imagine that a social impulse which dates from so far back, can be checked by the efforts of a generation ? Is it credible that the democracy which has annihilated the feudal system and vanquished kings, will respect the citizen and the capitalist ? Will it stop now that it is grown so strong and its adversaries so weak ?

“ None can say which way we are going, for all terms of comparison are wanting : the equality of conditions is more complete in the Christian countries of the present day, than it has been at any time, or in any part of the world ; so that the extent of what already exists prevents us from foreseeing what may be yet to come.

“ The whole book which is here offered to the public (“ Democracy in America ”) has been written under the impression of a kind of religious dread produced in the author’s mind by the contemplation of so irresistible a revolution, which has advanced for centuries in spite of such amazing obstacles, and which is still proceeding in the midst of the ruins it has made.

“ It is not necessary that God himself should speak in order to disclose to us the unquestionable signs of his will ; we can discern them in the habitual course of nature, and in the invariable tendency of events : I know, without a special revelation, that the planets move in the orbits traced by the Creator’s finger.

"If the men of our time were led by attentive observation and by sincere reflection, to acknowledge that the gradual and progressive development of social equality is at once the past and future of their history, this solitary truth would confer the sacred character of a divine decree upon the change. To attempt to check democracy would be in that case to resist the will of God; and the nations would then be constrained to make the best of the social lot awarded to them by Providence.

"The Christian nations of our age seem to me to present a most alarming spectacle; the impulse which is bearing them along is so strong that it cannot be stopped, but it is not yet so rapid that it cannot be guided: their fate is in their hands; yet a little while and it may be so no longer.

"The first duty which is at this time imposed upon those who direct our affairs is to educate the democracy; to warm its faith, if that be possible; to purify its morals; to direct its energies; to substitute a knowledge of business for its inexperience, and an acquaintance with its true interests for its blind propensities; to adapt its government to time and place, and to modify it in compliance with the occurrences and the actors of the age. A new science of politics is indispensable to a new world."¹

THE OBJECTS OF HISTORY.

In writing a history, whether it be of science, man, or of nations, the mind is influenced by certain definite motives in respect to the development of principles. The study of events, and the frequent repetition of the same phenomena connected with mind, condition or happiness, should result in opening to the understanding certain fundamental principles, which discover not only the great objects of life, but the surest means of their accomplishment. To assert, therefore, the following propositions, will not be deemed too formal by the reader, when he is assured that the chief motive in their assertion is to insure distinctness and simplicity. They are stated consecutively, that their logical relations may more readily be seen.

I. That man is capable of infinite progress, as the agent of knowledge and the seeker of power. II. That his sphere of action embraces (1st), Duties to himself and society, (2d), Duties to the nation of his nativity, (3d), Duties to the world, and (4th), Duties to God. III. That the proposition premising capacity for progress, comprehends certainty. IV. That certainty of fact implies certainty of means. V. That certainty of means implies knowledge and certainty of success; and, VI. That certainty of success is a fact proved both by the history of nations and by the condition of man.

¹ "Democracy in America," pp.12, 13, written 1836.

In view of these propositions, to be considered as one of a collective and relative character, it is proposed to give a brief review of history to show that the destiny of man is that of perpetual advancement in knowledge, freedom and happiness, and that DEMOCRACY is the great instrument by which these ends are to be accomplished.

It is a singular perversity of intellect, which has characterized almost every age, that, while physical results are traced with a confidence and certainty that give no place to doubt, the moral world is practically looked upon as subjected to no rule but that of chance, and without any recognition of fundamental laws.

If we turn to the physical sciences, we find each defined with a distinct view of their elements and objects. There is no ambiguity or uncertainty. A proposition is either proved to be true, or shown to be false. Why may not a more exact method be adopted in the study of history, so as to insure an accurate knowledge of events as causes, and arrive at a similar result, that the inquirer may be able to solve with more clearness the great problems of man's capability and destiny? To show that virtue is indissolubly connected with happiness, crime with misery, and industry with thrift and content? To show that the spirit of liberty is an eternal principle, and that nations are destined to be blessed by its unconquerable presence? To show that it is the nature of knowledge to disarm tyranny, and to dispel superstition? To show that life is but a warfare between the elements of good and evil, and that unlimited confidence in God is victory on the side of humanity?¹ To show that nations ruled by wisdom must prosper; and that nations governed by a disregard to justice must fall? To show that kings and emperors are to become as nothing — the people everything?² — and that what-

¹ These great and beautiful truths are illustrated by Providence. The principle of good in nature is admirably expressed by Baron Humboldt: "The ever restless impulsive force inherent in the very nature of things," he says, "incessantly struggles against the operation of every pernicious institution, while it promotes as actively everything of a beneficial tendency; so that we may accept it in the highest sense as true, that the sum of evil produced at any time, even by the most determined eagerness and activity, can never equal the fair amount of good that is everywhere and at all times spontaneously effected." — *The Sphere and Duties of Government*, p. 42.

² In reference to France, the Abbé Sieyès asked this question: "What is the *tiers-*

état?" And he answered, "Nothing." — "What ought it to be?" — "Everything."

That the people think and discriminate is no modern fact. Nearly 2000 years B. C., in the Chinese Empire — there were two parties described in ballads. The boys were taught to sing: "He who has established the multitude of us people is none other than your Eminence; (Emperor) we know and understand nothing, but to obey the Emperor's laws." There were some old men, however, who smote the clods, and sang along the roads, saying, — "At sunrise we engage in labor, and at sunset we rest; we dig our own wells and drink; we plough our own fields and eat; what does the Emperor's strength avail us?"

ever we think or do should be in harmony with the great plan of Divine Providence, as to what we are, and are to be?

A distinguished thinker uses the following language :

“In the moral world, as in the physical world, nothing is anomalous; nothing is unnatural; nothing is strange. All is order, symmetry and law. There are opposites, but there are no contradictions. In the character of a nation, inconsistency is impossible. Such, however, is still the backward condition of the human mind, and with so evil and jaundiced an eye do we approach the greatest problems, that not only common writers, but even men from whom better things might be hoped, are on this point involved in constant confusion, perplexing themselves and their readers by speaking of inconsistency as if it were a quality belonging to the subject which they investigate, instead of being, as it really is, a measure of their own ignorance. It is the business of the historian to remove this ignorance, by showing that the movements of nations are perfectly regular, and that, like all other movements, they are solely determined by their antecedents. If he cannot do this, he is no historian. He may be an annalist, or a biographer, or a chronicler; but higher than that he cannot rise, unless he is imbued with that spirit of science which teaches as an article of faith, the doctrine of uniform sequence; in other words, the doctrine that certain events having already happened, certain other events corresponding to them will also happen.”

THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF CREATION.

The Mosaic account of creation, though brief and allegorical, breathes the spirit of love in its teachings of gradual development. From chaos to order, from substance to form, from darkness to light, from light to beauty, and from organized matter to production, may be seen the diversified elements of a world springing into harmonious being and living action.

In alluding to early history, reference cannot be made with so much confidence to events, which are but imperfectly stated, as to the spirit of history itself. Its recitals are poetic, and knowledge may be gathered from the lofty sentiment which pervades them. It has been well remarked by an author of much merit that, “All that can make man happy upon earth, and bear him rejoicing up to heaven, has its beginning and its end in the worship of his Creator.”¹ The Hebrew knew no government but that of God, and was influenced by no power but that of divinity. “Wherever the Israelite turned, he was reminded,” says an intelligent writer, “of the presence of his God and of his King. His King was in heaven, his God was on earth.”²

The history of Moses is an important source of instruction, in so far as it

¹ Eliot's *Roman Liberty*.

² *Ib.*

relates to the condition of society in its earliest periods. In it is found a vivid description of an oppressive government, of a people struggling for liberty, and of a government party employing all the engines of its authority to oppose the party of freedom, which is designated as the party of the Lord. There the reader finds a lawgiver of supernatural energies, asking wisdom of his Maker to dispense to the people, that they might understand their rights, their duties and necessities. He consults for them with a lively concern, and predicts with truthful precision the blessings which flow from obedience to just laws, from habits of industry, and the inevitable penalties which await all who are wilfully indifferent to their requisitions.

Some profit might be derived from a study of Egypt, China,¹ and other ancient empires, by noting, so far as we should be able to do from the uncertain sources of history, the various causes of their growth, changes or decay; but we are admonished by the limits of this work to confine our remarks to such nations as will best illustrate the great topics to be discussed. These early periods are alluded to chiefly for the purpose of claiming for the subject under consideration the most extended inquiry, with the conviction that the reader will find ample historical evidence tending to prove that the elements of national existence before the Christian era are constantly being reproduced by the people and rulers of modern times, though in new and advanced combinations.²

INTERPRETATION OF LANGUAGE—UNCERTAINTIES OF HISTORY.

It is well remarked by Thierry that "the situation of civilized men varies and renews itself incessantly. Every century that passes over a people

¹ Yu, Emperor of China, 2204 B. C., suspended bells, drums, musical stones, rattles and tambours, for the service of the scholars who came from all quarters; saying, — "He who wishes to guide me in the right way, may beat the drum; he who can instruct me in rectitude, may ring the bell; he who may have any business to inform me of, may spring the rattle; those who have any complaint to make, may strike the musical stones; while those who have a cause to try, — may shake the tambour." What could be more democratic in an emperor?

² "In ancient times," says M. Guizot, "at every great epoch, all societies seem cast in the same mould: it is sometimes

pure monarchy, sometimes theocracy or democracy, that prevails; but each in its turn prevails completely. Modern Europe presents us with examples of all systems, of all experiments of social organization; pure and mixed monarchies, theocracies, republics, more or less aristocratic, have thus thrived simultaneously, one beside the other; and, notwithstanding their diversity, they have all a certain resemblance, a certain family likeness, which it is impossible to mistake." — *Hist. Civ. of Europe*, Vol. I, p. 24. In this diversity of form we find the elements of progress. As society advances, diversity lessens, and unity is approached.

leaves a different mode of life, different interest, different wants, from what it found. But in this succession of different states language does not change so rapidly as things, and it is rare that new facts meet at any given point with new signs that express them.”¹

The importance of this practical view can hardly be overestimated. The modes of expression employed by rude and ignorant nations are generally hyperbolical; and when we consider that every age, from the earliest to the latest periods, has its own standard of justice and refinement, its own schools of thought, and its own habits and customs, corresponding to the varying peculiarities of people, government and institutions, we cannot long be at a loss to account for the prolific sources of the uncertainties of history. In the transmission of knowledge from the ancient philosopher and orator to modern times, the scholar of each succeeding period is ambitious to afford to his generation an improved translation, a more polished diction of the classics, adding glory to the heroes and wisdom to the philosophers of history. The goodness of the great becomes magnified, the learning of the sage exaggerated, and the patriotism of the lawgiver exalted. The story of the battle-field, the loves of the poets, the burning eloquence of the rostrum, and the stately dignity of a Plato, a Lycurgus, a Cæsar, or a Pompey, and the glowing descriptions of regal splendor, are too often made the standards of present moral endeavor, and the ornaments of modern descriptions of greatness. A man of slight knowledge among the ancients was more the prodigy of his period than the most learned man of modern times.

In speaking of great men, M. Guizot seems to have surrendered his usual powers of analysis to the counsels of his fears, when he says, “From the time when labor has been free, and subject to the same laws for all, the number of men who have raised themselves to the first ranks in the liberal professions has not sensibly increased. It does not appear that there are now more great lawyers or physicians, more men of science or letters of the first order, than there were formerly. It is the men of the second order, and the obscure and idle multitude, that are multiplied.”²

M. Guizot seems to forget that, as the masses of society are elevated by the increasing means of genius and education, and as the professors of learning become more numerous, the standard of greatness is much higher than formerly. The possession of knowledge in ancient times was deemed almost as one of the prerogatives of sovereignty, or as within the sphere of theocratic rule. If a philosopher arose from the ranks of the common people, he was directly claimed as the companion for princes. Men of science seldom condescended to teach the ignorant, except to excite their sentiment of wonder, and the ignorant esteemed it presumption to aspire to a knowledge of the

¹ Hist. Essays, p. 25.

² Democracy in France, p. 32.

mysteries of mind. It must not be supposed that the spreading light of Christian civilization renders less certain or difficult the extraordinary developments of genius, so much as it tends to advance the common mind to the dignity of enlightened endeavors and intelligent appreciation.

It is to be admitted that the hallucinations of history sometimes shine with a borrowed light, and add to the spirit of ambitious endeavor. In actual ignorance of the powers of Demosthenes and Cicero, the orators of all coming time may hold them up as models, to be reached, — though many of modern times may have surpassed them in eloquence, and died without a name for posterity. Darkness is a necessary condition to the appreciation of light; and when sunshine is perpetual, it ceases to be prized as a blessing,¹ thus showing that the sources of mental activity exist less in what we see and possess, than in what we think and feel of what has been or may be.

Impressed with such considerations of allowance, we may speak of the Republics of Greece and Rome, and not commit the common error of measuring their sources of power, or causes of decay, by a standard of a doubtful scale.

REPUBLICS OF GREECE AND ROME.

The language of politics remains essentially unchanged, though varied in application. What sovereignty, submission, government, people, were to Athens or Rome, they are essentially to the nations of to-day. These words indicate the relations, but not the conditions, of power. The relations of duty are perpetual, but capacity may be adjusted to a low or to a high standard.

If we study the harmony of history, so far as it relates to Ancient Greece and Rome, we cannot fail to discover a state of society so entirely different from that of modern times, that we are led to exercise great care in building theories upon comparisons. It is sufficient for our present purpose to allude to the indisputable fact that the republics of Greece and Rome commenced their growth with the rudest elements of society, and gradually added to their sources of power, prosperity and character, by means of a special domestic activity in combination with a liberal policy in regard to foreigners. They were advanced by the spirit of democracy; and though they were occasionally interrupted, by departures from the principle, in their periods of decline, still, all their great and glorious conquests may be traced to the patriotism of the people responding to the demands of a liberal government. A careful study of history does not end in wonder why the republics of Greece and Rome

¹ In latitudes where the temperature of cloud or a storm is hailed with enthusiastic demonstrations of joy, the climate is uniform, and the sky clear, a demonstration of joy.

were not saved by democracy, but in the logical conviction which comes from knowledge that their civilization was too limited, too partial and too feeble, to be continued, except in dissolution, and in renewed combinations of a higher life and a more extended philosophy.

It is to be observed that the different cities of Greece were made up of men of different origin, tastes and endowments. Each class had its peculiar sphere of activity ; each developed a different portion of the human faculties, and each produced its own proper results ; and all found decay in the universal law of death to the partial or artificial conditions of ignorance, and to the rule of injustice.

The people of Athens were quick and bold, but they were deficient in the elements of endurance. They were in some degree intellectual, but their tastes tended rather to the refinements of art than to solid attainments.

They were industrious, and loved peace ; but the products of their labor were dissipated by licentious habits and luxurious living. What was designed by Providence to give the comforts of life to a nation proved fatal to them as a people.¹ If they were sometimes patriotic, they were often treacherous, and though evidently of a pacific disposition, compared with other people of the same period, they were broken into numerous factions, and failed to realize that unity of character and purpose so necessary to the permanency of national power. They announced their laws and administered justice with an apparent show of respect for the will of the people ; but they permitted no citizen to propose reform without incurring the risk of being rendered infamous by failure ; and if they had any conception of equal rights defined by law, they were shamefully faithless to their own avowed principles by a resort to *ostracism*, to remedy an evil arising from jealousy by a total disregard of the most obvious rights of humanity. Their concentration of genius upon the fine arts gave them a golden age, which will ever stand as a shining monument to their matchless achievements. But their sculptors and painters quarried but a single vein of the human mind ; and their productions of skill and beauty served rather to increase their pride and vanity than to extend the domain of wisdom. It has been said, that "while the object of Milton's *Paradise Lost* is to vindicate the ways of God to man, the ignoble subject of Homer's *Iliad* is the rage of Achilles." Their passions were alive to the externals of nature, to the personal relations of individuals ; but they accomplished but little toward maturing a judgment that could either point out or supply the legitimate wants of society, or comprehend the government of a nation.²

¹ Aristotle said of the Athenians, "That they have both wheat and laws : the wheat they make use of, the laws not."

² "It is customary," says an intelligent writer, "to contrast the fall of Athens with her greatness at one time, and to attribute that fall to her democracy. It seems to be

In noticing the Republic of LACEDÆMON, it will not be attempted to examine the ingenious theories of writers in regard to the origin of the peculiar government instituted by Lycurgus, all of them being worthy of perusal, though no one having the merit of presenting an analysis not liable to some objection.

Lycurgus was doubtless influenced by what he deemed to be the results of experience. He was of the eclectic school, and evidently endeavored to select the best features of the governments of foreign nations which he visited, and to reject whatever he supposed had resulted in more evil than good.¹ In his studies he saw national strength in a hardy and a military race. To him the physical world controlled the moral, — and yet he acknowledged a power above it. He saw that unity of character could only come from isolation, and that the foreign element rendered a people doubtful. He saw that commerce engendered selfishness, which was inconsistent with patriotism; and that money, though a convenient servant, was a corrupting and debasing master.² As he considered his mission to be that of a ruler and lawgiver, the state was paramount to all other interests. He sought for sources of strength in system which only come from character. He circumscribed his views to embrace only what concerned his own nation, leaving a similar independence to others. The individual was lost in the republic. He not only sought to control the elements of power, but to shut out, or literally to close, the conjectured sources of weakness, as if human nature could be expelled from the human breast. The romance of love was regarded as unmanly; the domestic affections, selfish. The fine arts and the refinements of society were looked upon as beneath the dignity of the state, and whatever bore the features of effeminacy was held in public contempt. A cursory view of his system shows that he saw danger in the partialities of parental love, danger in the affections of woman, and danger in whatever did not directly tend to the perfecting of the physical man, to the power of

forgotten, that, but for her democracy, she never would have had a place from which to fall."

¹ Plutarch says, that Lycurgus, on returning, after an absence of many years, which he had spent in Crete, Egypt, Africa, Spain and Asia, in conference with the learned men of all these countries, and in the study of their laws and governments, conceived the great design of entirely new modelling the laws and constitution of his country, then in the utmost disorder and imperfection.

² As money is a conventional power, and exists only by legislation, for the convenience of society, as a certificate of value, Lycurgus sought to protect it from abuse, by keeping it to its legitimate uses. His money was but a small improvement upon the ancient system of barter. The sum of ten *mina* — equal to about one hundred and fifty dollars — would, in the Spartan money, as Plutarch tells us, fill a large apartment, and could not be transported without a yoke of oxen.

the citizen, to the skill and bravery of the soldier, and the unity of the republic.¹

Such a system of government was not established without great and original energies of mind, nor without great difficulty.² It exhibits a theory which embraces contradictory elements ; and, while it provides with a careful hand for the exercise and cultivation of a portion of the human faculties, it proscribes and prohibits the activity of all the rest. But half of the man is recognized and acknowledged. The visible results of the Creator's might were looked upon as causes, — but the spirit of his love, which clothes a world in beauty, was undiscovered. More confidence was shown in the physical than in the moral nature of man ; and, while all the benefits were demanded which help to build up a state, the nation was counted nothing beyond its own sphere. The state claimed to encourage and protect the true interests of man, and yet esteemed the objects of life as beneath its dignity. It mistook the ultimate formations of society for the social and domestic duties of life ; and, while it was alive to everything which promised protection and defence, it discovered the singular absurdity of having nothing to defend.

The republic of Lacedæmon was more like a standing army, permanently encamped, than a nation ; and the people more like soldiers than citizens. Thus we have another example of a republic based upon a limited portion of the human faculties. It made but a partial provision for the whole nature of man, and the neglected faculties rebelled against the unnatural outrage.³

The people of Athens were false to humanity, by their exclusive devotion to the fine arts and poetry, as if luxuries were the sole objects of life ; and the Lacedæmonians committed a similar error, by opposing, though from motives of an opposite character, all the refinements of society, — as if war was to be the final destiny of nations. Both stand as representatives of extreme

¹ Children in Sparta were not considered as belonging to the individual parents, but to the state. After the performance of the first maternal duties, the youth were educated at the charge of the public ; and every citizen had as much authority over his neighbor's children as over his own. Slaves, in the same manner, were a species of common property. Every man might make use of his neighbor's slaves, and hunt, as Xenophon informs us, not only with his neighbor's servants, but with his dogs and horses.

² Although it was said by Plato that Lycurgus "appeared like a god among men," still, his regulation of the diet of the

citizens excited such commotion that, in a popular tumult, he had one of his eyes beaten out.

"It is false," says Thierry, "that assembled men ever gave themselves up to one amongst them, permitting him to arrange, and, as it is expressed, to constitute them in his own way." It is remarked by Ferguson, that "we must somewhat mistrust what tradition teaches us respecting ancient legislators and founders of kingdoms. The plans which are supposed to have proceeded from them were, probably, only the consequences of an anterior situation."

³ Still, there were two parties. The re-

experiments to illustrate the results of opposite causes; and both afford examples to prove that no nation can continue permanently to exist and prosper while it neglects to provide for the development of all the fundamental faculties of man.

REPUBLIC OF ROME.

Turning to ANCIENT ROME, a people is found early inspired by motives of ambition to control, and who were favored by unusual endowments of courage and firmness. Its early kings are represented as men of great energy; and, though the territory said to have been marked out by Romulus was small, still their policy had no limits, and they seem to have had an intuitive perception of many of those elements of growth which give power to a people and greatness to a nation.

Their ambition was not satisfied by the control of a domestic policy, and they early discovered a spirit to extend their possessions and to add to their population. They appear to have been divested of the natural prejudices peculiar to the races, and to have relied with great confidence upon a common union of people, of different origin, customs and languages. They received into fellowship strangers¹ of every grade who manifested a disposition to dwell among them; and they were surrounded by numerous colonies, or, more properly speaking, petty settlements, or towns, which were gradually subdued, and counted as so many glorious conquests.² The people were divided into two great classes,—the *patricians*³ and the *plebeians*; or, as

turn of the Heraclidæ gave two kings to Lacedæmon. In the partition of their conquests, Sparta fell to the share of Eurysthenes and Procles, the sons of Aristodemus, who agreed to a joint dominion, which should descend, in the same manner, to their posterity. The sovereignty, split into two branches, remained thus divided for about nine hundred years. Condillac remarks that the throne seemed preserved in the line of the Heraclidæ, only with the view of preventing any citizen from aspiring to it; and two kings were, in reality, less dangerous to liberty than one, since they constantly kept alive two opposite parties, each restraining the other's ambition, and thus preventing all approach to tyranny.

¹ Tacitus, Vol. I, p. 7.

² "History of Civilization of Europe," by M. Guizot: Vol. I, p. 27.

³ The *patricians* were the first order, or nobility, of the Roman people. When the constitution of Rome was monarchical, they elected the king; and after the expulsion of the Tarquins, all the great officers of the state—as consuls, prætors, &c.,—were chosen from their body for many generations. Of the *patricians*, also, the senate was composed; but, in after times, both this and the great magistracies were thrown open to the *plebeians*. The *plebeians*, though personally independent, in early times had no political power. The government was entirely in the hands of the *patricians*, who, with their clients and the king, formed the original people. The *plebeians* gradually gained ground, till, in the last ages of the

some assert, but not with much claim to accuracy, the conquerors and the conquered.¹

However obscure the early history of Rome may be considered, it is obviously certain that the original settlers were not only characterized by a singular unity of purpose and feeling, but by an intuitive knowledge of principles. Romulus, it is said by the historian, was particular to show marked "respect for immortality obtained by merit;" and when he gave to the rude and uninformed people a body of laws, he added to the dignity of his own carriage by assuming the ensigns of sovereignty, that the occasion might be remembered and respected.

Livy claims for the Romans great purity and magnanimity of character, and a profound respect for justice. Perhaps this language might be regarded, at the period in which he wrote, as truthful and applicable; but not in the sense which would be implied by the use of such terms at the present day. The same author, in speaking of Cincinnatus, says, "He was the sole hope of the empire of Rome;" and this was at a period when the pompously announced empire did not extend more than twenty miles beyond the city!² To have been so long the mistress of the world, is a fact that will account for much of the extravagance of history, and for many of the discrepancies of historians. During a portion of the period of her glorious rule, she may have been, comparatively speaking, the first in virtue, as well as the first in arms. Admitting such to be the fact, it is not to be inferred that the civilization of ancient Rome was anything more than a mere germ of what

republic, they participated in all the affairs of the government.

¹ Lucius Tarquinius is said to have afforded the first instance of making way to the crown by paying court to the people, and to have made a speech composed for the purpose of gaining the affections of the populace, — telling them that "it was no new favor which he solicited; if that were the case, people might indeed be displeased and surprised; that he was not the first foreigner, but the third (alluding to Tatius and Numa), who aimed at the government of Rome." — *Baker's Livy*, Vol. 1, p. 26.

When Caius Flavius, son of Cneius, grandson of a freedman, — a notary, in low circumstances, originally, — was appointed *curule ædile*, it excited great indignation in most of the nobles, who laid aside their gold rings and bracelets in consequence of it, —

a truly aristocratic indignation! "From that time," says Titus Livius, "the state was split into two parties. The uncorrupted part of the people, who favored and supported the good, held one side; the faction of the rabble, the other." It is not a little remarkable that Livy, in making this remark, should have forgotten the eloquent speech of Caius Canuleius, given in his own work, who triumphantly exhibits the achievements of this "faction of the rabble." — (See *Ibid* Vol. 1, p 136.

² Dionysius of Halicarnassus discredited his own authority, by confessing the motives which led to his extravagant expressions in regard to the Romans. He desired to make a popular history, and one that would flatter the pride of the Romans, as well as inspire his own countrymen, the Greeks, with a high idea of the dignity of their conquerors.

civilization is in modern times. We speak of civilization in the enlarged sense of the term, — as embracing the objects of life, and the knowledge of things.¹ It is giving to the ancient Romans an enviable position, to concede an early conception of the grand outline of man's future greatness. That they extended the domain of mind, and exercised a greater number of the human faculties than any people of a previous period, is certainly true. But their labors were rudimental in the formation of nations; and though highly suggestive, they are to be looked upon as parts of a great whole, detached from the original framework of their period, and showing how much was left to decay in their decline, and how little to remain as the monuments of their genius and greatness.

There is no nation of ancient times, perhaps, which better illustrates the sources of prosperity and adversity than the Republic of Rome. Its long continued existence, and sovereign sway, — its universal control of nations, as well as of people, — placed within its reach all the diversified elements of power, and gave the Romans the means of testing the value of every new thought, and of trying every variety of experiment peculiar to their times. They lived to see the growth of habits which generations accumulate, and to reap the reward of obedience to natural laws, or to suffer the penalties which are sure to follow their violation.²

It is a remark of a learned historian, that "No nation has afforded a more striking example than the Romans have done of the necessity of good morals to the preservation of political liberty, and the happiness of the people."³ This opinion is but the repetition of the advice of Phocion to Aristias. "Accustom your mind," said he, "to discern in the prosperity of nations, that recompense which the author of nature has affixed to the practice of virtue; and in their adversity, the chastisement which he has thought proper to bestow on vice."⁴

The proposition that virtue is indispensably necessary to the permanent prosperity of a nation is theoretically admitted by all. But, in stating this, it should not be forgotten to add another, embracing the equal necessity of knowledge. It was a remark of a Chinese historian, 1100 years B. C., in speaking of the ancients of the empire, that "though they were far advanced in virtue they still warned and informed one another." A virtuous blind

¹ See "Republic of United States of America," &c., p. 13.

throw of those free governments." — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. v, p. 930.

² "It is most evident, to all such as are in the least acquainted with the Greek and Roman histories," says a writer in the seventeenth century, "that bribery and corruption were the chief causes of the over-

³ Tytler.

⁴ Lord Bolingbroke says, "The grandeur of Rome was the work of many centuries, the effect of much wisdom, and the price of much blood."

man may walk over a precipice ; an honest traveller may lose his way ; and an athletic wrestler, untrained in the art of swimming, may sink, powerless, in the flood. So a well-disposed people may abuse their privileges, and lose their liberties, through ignorance, — from want of knowledge of the requisite means to sustain them. In all such examples, the causes of failure may be mostly traced to defective knowledge of the natural laws, and of the fundamental principles of government.

Because the republic of Rome was independent as a nation, it does not follow that the Romans were free as a people. The sources of national existence may spring from the arbitrary exercise of individual power, from the conventional combinations of different races, or from the development of individual faculties. France, Russia, Austria, are independent nations ; but their people are far from being free. Mexico, and the republics of South America, are nominally independent nations ; but they stumble from constitutional weakness, and are weighed down by the shackles of ignorance, and blinded by the delusions of superstition.

The fabled origin of Rome sufficiently indicates the spirit and pride of her people. Her founder was the reputed son of Mars ; and how true the people were to the god of war may be seen in the fact that the temple of Janus was closed but once during a period of eight hundred years.¹

If the Romans were brave, it must be confessed that they were turbulent ; and, if patriotic, that their highest motives were those of conquest. Their examples of magnanimity were but exhibitions of power ; and their acts of justice, condescensions of grace. Their zeal for freedom was but an unlimited confidence in the power of the strongest, and their philanthropy a pride, engendered in the scant benevolence of a clan, a class or a party.

It is a proverbial saying, “that the corruptions of the best things are the worst ;” and Lord Bolingbroke makes an application of it to the republic of Rome. Although the proverb may be true to a limited degree, yet it not only fails to explain itself, but conveys an error by implication. Things do not become the worst because they have been the best ; for this would be a confusion of language, premising an evil consequence as the effect of a good cause. The best things fail, because they are not sustained by other things to correspond. One good thing is not sufficient to form a character, or to save a nation. The best and worst things of a nation grow together, as the

¹ This temple was closed only during the period of Rome's existence, — once in the time of peace. It was during the interval reign of Numa, and the second time, after between the war against the Cantabri and the first Punic War, in the consulship of T. Manlius Torquatus.—*Niebuhr's Rome*, Vol. v, p. 89.

wheat and the tares of the planter. But the mastery of the good or the evil is only seen at the harvest-time.¹ If the worst things prevail, the best are excluded, and a nation ceases. If the best things prevail, the worst are abated, and the nation is seen to be one of progress.

A survey of the vast field of the past, as represented by history, in which the ruins of the Roman empire lie scattered and covered by the dust of centuries, cannot fail to discover the crumbling fragments of tyranny, ferocity, ignorance, childish frivolity, inordinate appetite and infamy, mixed with the huge piles of departed power and grandeur. The founder taking the blood of a brother;² an Emperor, Commodus, regardless of the decencies of nature, corrupting his own sisters, keeping three hundred women, and as many boys, — to satisfy his disgusting lusts, and claiming of the senate divine honors which were granted; a daughter in exultation riding over the dead body of a vanquished father;³ the wife of a ruler spitting upon the trunkless head of a Cicero, and piercing his lifeless tongue with a bodkin;⁴ a senate abased by the childish act of driving a nail into the sacred temple to stay an epidemic; the Carib gladiator desecrating the earth by his unholy vows, and pledging devotion to all that is revolting and monstrous;⁵ rulers that were degraded by lust and violence, and patricians that were

¹ Matt. 13: 25-30.

² When Romulus began to lay the foundations of Rome, and marked with a furrow the place where he wished to erect the walls, their slenderness was ridiculed by Remus, his brother, who leaped over them with the greatest contempt. This greatly irritated Romulus, and Remus was immediately put to death, either by the hand of his brother or one of his workmen.

³ This was Tullia, a daughter of Servius Tullius, King of Rome. She married Tarquin the Proud, after she had murdered her first husband, Aruns; and consented to see Tullius assassinated, that Tarquin might be raised to the throne. It is said that she ordered her chariot to be driven over the body of her aged father, which had been thrown, all mangled and bloody, in one of the streets of Rome.

⁴ Cicero was overtaken while attempting to flee. His head was cut off, and carried, with his hands, to Antony. Fulvia, the wife of Antony, took the head in her lap,

spit upon it, and, drawing out the tongue, pierced it several times with a bodkin.

⁵ These gladiators were taught not only the use of their arms, but likewise the graceful postures of falling when they were wounded, and the finest attitudes in which to die. Their food was of such a nature as to enrich and thicken their blood, so that it might flow more slowly through their wounds, and thus give to the spectators a prolonged exhibition of their dying agonies. On entering their profession, these miserable beings were accustomed to take the following oath: "We swear that we will suffer ourselves to be bound, scourged, burned, or killed by the sword, or whatever else Eumolpus ordains; and thus, like FREE-BORN gladiators, we religiously devote both soul and body to our master."

Emperor Commodus, desirous of being called Hercules, like that hero he adorned his shoulders with a lion's skin, and armed his hand with a knotted club. He showed himself naked in the amphitheatre, and fought with the gladiators.

debased by cupidity and bribery; a nation continuing for a period of five hundred years without a practical knowledge of the divisions of time;¹ a people demanding death to their best men, and life and authority for their worst;² Cæsar provoking a vomit that he might gorge at the supper-table of Cicero;³ great Scipio playing with the pebbles and shells on the banks of the Lucrine;⁴ and, as if necessary to complete the humbling picture, we see a people rejoicing in the infamy of an emperor,⁵ — an emperor taking the life of his mother,⁶ singing to the furious flames that were consuming the capital, and a government so lost to all pride and decency as to sell the control of the empire to the highest bidder, by public auction.⁷

The "worst things" had prevailed, and the best had been excluded. A mere glimpse of the offensive picture is all that can be given here. Something more was wanting than faithfulness to what they had. From the beginning, they were destitute of the vital elements to be found only in Christian civilization.

But, if we look to the means employed by the Romans to advance the grandeur and power of the republic, we shall find them chiefly represented in

¹ Extraordinary as it may appear to us, it is certain that the Romans were, for nearly five centuries, utterly ignorant of the day by hours, and knew no other distinction but that of morning, mid-day and evening. — *Tytler*, VOL. I, p. 448.

² "Rome was governed by the arbitrary will of the worst of her own citizens, of both sexes; by Caligula, Nero, Messalina, Agrippina, Poppæa, Narcissus, Calistus, Pallas, — by princes who were stupid or mad." — *Bolingbroke on Parties*, p. 275.

³ When Julius Cæsar paid a reconciliatory visit to Cicero by inviting himself to sup with him, he took care to let Cicero know that he had taken a vomit beforehand, and was resolved to make a most enormous meal; and Cicero tells us he kept his word, which, for his own part, he took very kindly, as a mark of Cæsar's great politeness. — *Cic. Epist. ad. Attic.*, 13, 52.

⁴ *Cic. de Oratore*, lib. ii., c. 6.

⁵ Poppæa, a woman of great beauty, but abandoned morals, had been seduced from her husband by Otho, who in his turn prostituted her to the emperor, to serve his own

purposes of ambition. She soon gained such an ascendancy over Nero, that he was induced to divorce his wife Octavia, to make way for her to the throne; and such was at this time the infamous servility of the Roman senate, that a panegyric was pronounced in praise of the emperor, and a deputation sent to congratulate him on this auspicious event. — *Tytler*, VOL. I, p. 487.

⁶ Nero.

⁷ After Pertinax was openly murdered in the palace, Sulpicianus, the father-in-law of Pertinax, demanded the empire from the prætorians, who replied to him that he should have his chance for it at a fair auction, as they had resolved to bestow it on the highest bidder. Didius Julianus, a wealthy senator, was present when the intelligence was delivered. He was persuaded instantly to repair to the prætorian camp, and bidding at once a considerable sum beyond the offer of Sulpicianus, he was immediately proclaimed emperor, and the senate did not scruple to sanction the infamous proceeding. Didius reigned sixty-six days.

the unsleeping spirit of democracy.¹ We shall find how the willingness of the higher classes to grant, was surpassed by the energy of the lower to win, the extension of liberty in Rome.²

The history of Rome is filled with the conflicts of party. The party lines were deeply drawn from the first, and the plebeians were left to struggle alone against oppression, until there arose a rivalry between the kings and the patricians, and then the people were courted by both for influence. If we turn to their legislation, we find the people gradually gaining their rights and establishing them. On the one hand, the senate, sustained by a powerful aristocracy, began by controlling the institutions of religion, the science of government, the objects of industry, the means of wealth, the prerogatives of peace and war, and the immunities of freedom. On the other, the people, made up of every variety of nation and language, — at first, ignorant of their rights, and still more so of the means necessary to secure them; willing and brave as soldiers, and proud as citizens; though unconscious of their importance to the republic, still ready to serve in all enterprises tending to add to its glory, — soon discovered that they had comforts to defend, privileges to secure, rights to understand, prerogatives to assert, and a conscious dignity which inheres in self-knowledge, and glows in the spirit of freedom, — to guard, defend, and to hold as sacred. They soon found, what the people of every nation have been destined to realize, not only the necessities of their political condition, but that they were opposed by a party of men who claimed distinctions on account of their rank, wealth and power, and who professed to be allied to the gods. Their advancement in knowledge, and developments of sentiment by the exciting circumstances of a growing state, gave definiteness to their will and form to their wishes. Their petitions for reform were strenuously opposed by the conservative party; but the democracy of the people prevailed. Their early expectations were modest, but every gain of power revealed new views of right; and a history of their continued petitions is but the record of the means employed to build up the glory of the Republic. Added to these sources of strength and partisan activity, we should not omit to estimate the foreign element which pressed from without, and gave to the party conflicts at home a greater unity, and freed the state in a great degree from the annoyance of numerous factions to which they were liable, on account of the great diversity of people who inhabited their territory, having separate or peculiar interests.

There is no better monument to the glory of the democracy of ancient

¹ The progress of the democratic party is speech to the Romans, as given by Livy, admirably given by Caius Canuleius, in a Vol. I, p. 136.

² Eliot's "Liberty of Rome."

times than the Roman laws, which still have a living influence in the councils of all nations.¹

It is not the present purpose to speak of the particular causes of the fall of Rome; for even a brief recital of their origin, nature and subsequent workings, is precluded by the limits of this work. The seeds of decay were planted at an early period of the nation; and, while it was not within the limits of a Cæsar's ambition or a Nero's wickedness to destroy, it was not given to the eloquence of a Cicero or the questionable patriotism of a Cassius or Brutus to save the Roman Empire.

The fall of the Empire was the close of one political state, to be followed by others adapted to the moral wants and conditions of the world. Christianity began a new and distinct formation.²

HUMAN PROGRESS.

If the progress of man be traced, even from his earliest condition, he will be found passing through separate and distinctive periods of growth, apparently in succession, though in mutual correspondence, and each suited to the special development either of a class of faculties, or tending to mature a new phase of society. The period may be one of war, religious sentiment, political conflict, national consolidation or dissolution, or of social or moral reform.

A great interest or a prominent feature of humanity is thus taken up, made the subject of universal discussion, developed for the instruction of an inquiring world, and sufficiently advanced to serve as a permanent element of future progress. It stands as a block rough hewn, suited to repair the great temple of society, and adapted to the wants of a coming period. The mind then returns, in its ceaseless activity, to bring forward another principle, another class of faculties, — still another and another, — each advancement creating a new necessity for others. These processes, apparently so partial, seeming alternately to favor and to neglect the momentous interests of man, often afford a temporary triumph to the sceptic, and confound the limited minds of the superficial and ignorant.

The progress of humanity may be likened to the successive necessities of repairing the ancient homestead. Sons are unwilling to disturb the old

¹ "It might, indeed, be affirmed," says D'Aguesseau, "that justice has fully developed her mysteries only to the Roman lawyers. Legislators rather than juriconsults, mere individuals in the shades of private life, have had the merit, by the su-

periority of their intelligence, to give laws to all posterity."

² Guizot says that "Christianity was an essentially practical revolution, — not a mere scientific, speculative reform."

framework of their fathers, and yet the decay of parts imperatively calls for repairs. But every attempt to add and to beautify discovers defects by comparison, and the skill of the mechanic and artist stands in permanent requisition.

“It was at the very time that the Roman Empire fell to pieces and disappeared,” says M. Guizot, “that the Christian church rallied, and definitely formed herself. Political unity perished, — religious unity arose.”

One is not inclined to make exceptions to the eloquent language of Guizot, although it may be permitted to ask a more permanent place for religion than is implied by his language. Religious influence may not always be visible to the eye of philosophy, — but it is a false philosophy that assigns to it an occasional place. It is true the church may be false to the principle upon which it professes to be based; and in this view, probably, it is that M. Guizot alludes to the visible recovery of her true position. Our assent can be given to no theory that for a moment precludes the eye of Deity, or gives to the rule of chance a sway above that of Providence. The light of religion may be temporarily obscured by gusts of passion and the fearful throes of revolution, as that of the sun may be by the clouds of the tornado and tempest; but its power never rests, — its glorious splendor never ceases. Its work is certain, and never finished. Its mission is to stay the weak, to lead the strong, and to control the mighty. Its light is graduated to every degree of mental vision, its form to every condition of society, and its inexhaustible treasures are held for the use of every age and nation. The form of its activity is but the husk; but its principle is that of unity itself, — subduing, enlarging and ever purifying the sources of happiness, and elevating the true dignity of man. The church became the practical form of its manifestation, adapted to an advanced civilization; and we find its holy ministers in the priests and bishops, after the dissolution of the Roman Empire, clothed with authority as the principal municipal magistrates to regenerate society, reorganize states, and to build up nations.¹ It has ever been thus with early political growth. Society has been preserved and guided by the unerring hand of theocracy.

FRANCE.

It would, indeed, be a profitable study, in this connection, to trace the progress of FRANCE from the earliest dates to its great and changing periods of development, and to note the different stages of civilization and the vary-

¹ “This is a glorious and powerful fact,” fifth to the thirteenth century, has rendered says M. Guizot, “and one which, from the immense services to humanity.”

ing forms of liberty ; to see the paternal instrumentalities of the church, and the long-continued training of feudalism in preparing a barbarous and ignorant people, of different origins and habits, for nationality ; to point out the gradual and timid rise and bold maturity of royalty, the constantly changing aspects of aristocracy, the mission of the papacy, and the important results of the crusades and chivalry, — but these are topics only to be glanced at, not treated of within the narrow limits of a preliminary chapter.

Such a course of study will still develop the great fact, that all forms of society, all forms of human action, by whatever name they are known, are but tributary streams to the great ocean of democracy. They help to swell the mighty flood on whose bosom humanity rests, and by whose flowing and ebbing tides the ruins of tyranny are to be swept away, and the unspeakable blessings of freedom to be gathered in. France is a beautiful and prolific field for the reaper ; and the history of her kings and emperors, her bishops, priests, monks, knights, philosophers, statesmen and patriots, indicates the progressive changes of power, the growing strength of the people, and the ultimate ascendancy of democracy.

. De Tocqueville says, — “ In France the kings have always been the most active and the most constant of levellers. When they were strong and ambitious, they spared no pains to raise the people to the level of the nobles ; when they were temperate or weak, they allowed the people to rise above themselves. Some assisted the democracy by their talents, others by their vices. Louis XI, and Louis XIV, reduced every rank beneath the throne to the same subjection ; Louis XV, descended, himself and all his Court, into the dust.

“ As soon as land was held on any other than a feudal tenure, and personal property began in its turn to confer influence and power, every improvement which was introduced in commerce or manufacture, was a fresh element of the equality of conditions. Henceforward every new discovery, every new want which it engendered, and every new desire which craved satisfaction, was a step toward the universal level. The taste for luxury, the love of war, the sway of fashion, the most superficial as well as the deepest passions of the human heart, co-operated to enrich the poor and to impoverish the rich.

“ From the time when the exercise of the intellect became the source of strength and of wealth, it is impossible not to consider every addition to science, every fresh truth, and every new idea, as a germ of power placed within the reach of the people. Poetry, eloquence and memory, the grace of wit, the glow of imagination, the depth of thought, and all the gifts which are bestowed by Providence with an equal hand, turned to the advantage of democracy ; and even when they were in possession of its adversaries, they

still served its cause by throwing into relief the natural greatness of man ; its conquests spread, therefore, with those of civilization and knowledge ; and literature became an arsenal, where the poorest and weakest could always find weapons to their hand.

“ In perusing the pages of our history, we shall scarcely meet with a single great event, in the lapse of seven hundred years, which has not turned to the advantage of equality.”¹

Democracy in France has been successively protected against its conservative enemy, in different shapes, and under divers garbs and names, by its own inherent power, being allied with the mayors of the palace, the church, the pope, and even with royalty itself. Its own spirit is unchangeable, approaching to and receding from the centralization of power, and alternately melting despotism and diffusing light to the extremities of society. Its principles are found acknowledged in the bulls of the Popes, and set forth with remarkable clearness by some of the most distinguished bishops of France, and exemplified by practical examples.

An examination of the *capitularies* of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonnaire, Charles le Chauve, Louis le Beque, Carloman, Eudes and Charles le Simple, and the legislation of the succeeding reigns, will discover a gradual yielding to democratic influence, invariably showing that progress is always in proportion to the degree of justice extended to the people. It is not necessary to speak of the special and dictatorial edicts of usurpers, who, while they plan oppression for others, prepare for their own destruction and a further extension of liberty ; but of the legislation which stands the test of enlightened public opinion without respect to party, and upon subjects which have ceased to be open questions. France, like all other nations, has had its periods of tyranny and anarchy. But these conditions are temporary, or apparent, and may be regarded as preparatory to a freer play of “ the powerful spring of democracy.”²

The spirit of democracy was manifested in the reign of Charlemagne, in crushing the remnants of barbarism, and preparing for the people a higher form of civilization. We see it in the *communes* of Cambrai, Laon, Noyon, Beauvais and St. Quentin, in the ninth and twelfth centuries. We see it in “ the revolutions that for eight hundred years have swept over France, taking their rise, by feeble and imperceptible gradations, from the foot of Philip’s throne, and swelling from age to age, to be precipitated in unmeasurable proportions into the midst of our own epoch.”³ We find it in the teachings

¹ Democracy in America, p. xi.

furious,” said Napoleon, “ but it has some

² It was a remark of Mitford, “ that democracy, though a wretched regulator, was a powerful spring.” “ Democracy may be

heart, it may be moved. As to aristocracy, it is always cold and unforgiving.”

³ Dumas.

of Hottoman, Lanquet, La Boétie, Rose, Mariana, Bodin and others of the sixteenth century. In noticing a work published in 1578, entitled "*Le Contre Un, ou Discours de la Servitude Volontaire*," by Stephen de la Boétie, Hallam says, "Roused by the flagitious tyranny of many contemporary rulers, and none were worse than Henry II, under whose reign it was probably written, La Boétie pours forth the vehement indignation of a youthful heart, full of the love of virtue and of the brilliant illusions which a superficial knowledge of ancient history creates, against the voluntary abjectness of mankind, who submit as slaves to one no wiser, no braver, no stronger than any of themselves." His language is full of meaning and instruction. He says, — "He who so plays the master over you has but two eyes, has but two hands, has but one body, has nothing more than the least among the vast number who dwell in our cities; nothing has he better than you, save the advantage that you give him, that he may ruin you. Whence has he so many eyes to watch you, but that you give them to him? How has he so many hands to strike you, but that he employs your own? How does he come by the feet which trample on your cities, but by your means? How can he have any power over you, but what you give him? How could he venture to persecute you, if he had not an understanding with yourselves? What harm could he do you, if you were not receivers of the robber that plunders you, accomplices of the murderer who kills you, and traitors to your own selves? You, you sow the fruits of the earth, that he may waste them; you furnish your houses, that he may pillage them; you rear your daughters, that they may glut his wantonness, and your sons, that he may lead them at the best to his wars, or that he may send them to execution, or make them the instruments of his concupiscence, the ministers of his revenge. You exhaust your bodies with labor, that he may revel in luxury, or wallow in base and vile pleasures; you weaken yourselves that he may become more strong, and better able to hold you in check. And yet from so many indignities, that the beasts themselves, could they be conscious of them, would not endure, you may deliver yourselves, if you but make an effort, not to deliver yourselves, but to show the will to do it. Once resolve to be no longer slaves, and you are already free. I do not say that you should assail him, or shake his seat; merely support him no longer, and you will see that, like a great Colossus, whose basis has been removed from beneath him, he will fall by his own weight, and break to pieces."¹

In connecting "the love of virtue with the brilliant illusions which a superficial knowledge of ancient history creates," — Hallam failed to distinguish between truth and opinion. Whatever has been realized even once in the world, and found to be in harmony with God's laws, is *truth*. When

¹ Lit. of Europe, Vol. II, p. 115.

confirmed by many historical examples, no patriotic expectations, however great, either indicate a superficial knowledge of history, or can be denominated the illusions of excessive zeal. The peaceful remedy proposed by La Boétie, is particularly to be noticed and commended as eminently democratic. Violence or revolution against a constitutional government is no part of democracy.

What nobler democrats can be found in modern times than the people of Laon, in the twelfth century, who, alone, led on to revolution in defence of their rights, and struck down their traitor bishop? Six hundred years later, when the people had acquired a common consciousness of nationality, a common pride, and a more general knowledge of their common rights, its mighty power may be seen rising superior to the accumulated weight of oppression, and with the terrible fury of popular indignation, upheaving society from its very base, and scattering death and desolation throughout the land.¹

¹ The oppressions of government were so great that they led the people of France to doubt the existence of Deity. They could not reconcile a kind and superintending Providence with so much tyranny and suffering. The French National Convention, October 16, 1793, decreed that "*death is an eternal sleep.*" The atheism of the people did not produce the revolution, but the wickedness of the rulers made the people atheists.

"Human thought," says Lamartine, "like God, makes the world in its own image. Thought was revived by a philosophical age. It had to transform the social world. The French Revolution was therefore in its essence a sublime and impassioned spirituality. It had a divine and universal ideal. This is the reason why its passion spread beyond the frontiers of France. Those who limit, mutilate it. It was the accession of three moral sovereignties: The sovereignty of right over force; the sovereignty of intelligence over prejudices; the sovereignty of people over governments; revolution in rights; equality. Revolution in ideas; reasoning substituted for authority. Revolution in facts; the reign of the people. A gospel of social rights. A gospel of duties, a charter of humanity. France declared itself the apostle of this creed. In this war

of ideas France had allies everywhere, and even on thrones themselves." — *Hist. Girondists*, Vol. I, p. 19.

The victories of the French republic were celebrated in America. On the 24th January, 1793, Chandler Robbins, D. D., delivered an address to the inhabitants of Plymouth, Mass., assembled to celebrate the victories of the French republic over their invaders. He selected for a text "that remarkable passage" in Daniel, second chapter, twentieth and twenty-first verses: "*Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are his. He changeth the times and the seasons, HE REMOVETH KINGS.*" At this time (1793) Great Britain, Russia, Spain, Prussia and the Emperor of Germany, made a treaty for the purpose, among other things, of closing their ports, "and prohibiting the exportation of all military or naval stores, corn, grain and provisions, from their ports, for the ports of France." They further engaged "to take all other measures in their power for injuring the commerce of France," &c. — *Lyman's Diplomacy*, Vol. I, p. 177.

"The French Revolution has produced incalculable blessings to that country. Before that revolution, one-third of the property of the kingdom was in the hands of the clergy, the rest in the hands of the

Again and again, but with abated passion and destructiveness, in 1830 and 1848,¹ France became the field of revolutionary horrors, and the dignity of man was asserted by the stern rebukes of democracy. But in the great mission of Napoleon, the world was startled at the mighty strides of its power, in extending the area of national freedom. What ancient Rome was to the world, Alexander to the fourth century (B. C.), Charlemagne to the ninth (A. D.), Napoleon was to the nineteenth, — an instrument to sever the present from the fetters of the past. Insecurity at home, national apathy and a growing contempt for the rights of the people among the European powers, rendered necessary the scourge of a conqueror, the sway of a despot, whose deeds and rule should subdue the insufferable spirit of tyranny, and teach hereditary sovereigns, resting on the merits of birth, a liberal policy and a becoming humility. Such missions benefit a generation, though their excesses are fatal to their projectors.² The rule of Napoleon had its grandeur and great benefits; yet when he fell, he had ceased to be a friend to freedom.³

nobility. Where the interest of one individual has been sacrificed, the interest of thousands have been promoted. After dining with that friend of universal liberty, the patriotic La Fayette, he once invited me to walk upon the top of his house, that commanded a view of all the surrounding country. 'Before the revolution,' said he, 'all the farms and hamlets you see were mine. I am now reduced to a thousand acres; and I exult in the diminution, since the happiness of others is promoted by participation.'" — *Speech of Peter R. Livingston, N. Y. Hammond's Polit. Hist. N. Y., Vol. II, p. 45.*

¹ "The year 1793," says M. Dumas, "gave birth to a *revolution*, but not to a republic; this latter word was adopted in hatred of royalty, and not as descriptive of existing institutions. The revolution of 1830," he continues, "did not exceed its commission; it attained only what it was destined to attain; it destroyed what it was destined to destroy. A revolution believed to be new, but which was the offspring of 1793. A revolution which lasted only three days, because it had only the wreck of aristocracy to exterminate."

Guizot, in 1849, says with an impatient

spirit: "We have tried everything: — Republic — Empire — Constitutional Monarchy. We are beginning our experiments anew. To what must we ascribe their ill success? In our own times, before our own eyes, in three of the greatest nations in the world, these three forms of government — Constitutional Monarchy in England, the Empire in Russia, and the Republic in North America — endure and prosper. Have we the monopoly of all impossibilities?"

² In twenty-eight years, Alexander the Great and all his relations were deceased.

³ "Napoleon appeared," says M. Dumas, "with his twofold propensity for despotism and war, — his twofold nature, popular and aristocratic. He was behind the ideas of France, but in advance of the ideas of Europe; a man of resistance as to his own people, but of progression as to others."

* * "He fell in 1815, and scarcely three years had rolled away ere the revolutionary fields were ready for the harvest. In 1818, the Grand Duchies of Baden and Bavaria claimed and obtained a constitution. In 1819, Wurtemberg claimed a constitution and obtained it. In 1820, revolution and constitution of Naples and Piedmont. In

His spirit still pervades the nation whose glory it was his ambition so long to advance. With fever heat it races through the veins of the multitude, reviving the glories of the past as painted on the memory, and leaps, with frenzied dreaming, at objects which weakness fancies, but which genius cannot see.

Who but a blood relation can cure the national epidemic!—bleed the nation, and reduce the vapors of the Napoleonic fever! stand forth in the form and name of the illustrious dead,—substituting imbecility for greatness, folly for wisdom, treason for magnanimity, cowardice for mercy, perjury for justice, mockery for a constitution, spies for a press, a guard-house for freedom, an army for patriotism, and a despotism for a church! Whoever shall be able to do this will free the people of France from this blind infatuation for deeds without motives, and immortalize himself by being foremost voluntarily to help a nation by disgrace and infamy. His elevation to power would draw all eyes to the pitiful abortion of a nominal succession without the sanction of law, and his fall would be like that of the ignoble remains of a rocket,—the frame-work of a departed splendor, divested of its functions and returned to the earth in its own inherent darkness. The French nation would then be exempted from the entailment of error unaccompanied by genius, and democracy would reign triumphant on the continent of Europe. The name of Napoleon would still live in the monuments of his glory, but the race would be extinct in the ruins of his successor.¹

France will long be subjected to great changes and revolutions. To great contests within and without. They will be terrible and destructive to bear,—but they will ultimately prove to be the sources of national strength and glory.

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF NATIONS.

In pursuing these remarks touching the origin, growth and peculiarities, of different nations, the purpose is, briefly, to afford to the reader such hints as will lead him to study principles, and give such illustrations as shall tend to show, in some degree, the practical uses of history. Historical narrative is not the object. It is but a small matter to know that such men as Confucius, Plato, Bacon or Franklin, lived, unless some definite knowledge is attained of their respective periods, their sources and means of influence,

1821, insurrection of the Greeks against Turkey. In 1828, institution of the states in Prussia."

things of immense value: within, civil order strongly constituted; without, national independence firmly established."

"Democratic France," to use the language, of M. Guizot, "owes much to the Emperor Napoleon. He gave her two

¹ This was written when Louis Napoleon was proposed as a candidate for the presidency.

and a just estimate is made of the value of what they accomplished and of what they taught. The same view is true in regard to nations. They are embodied in history, and stand as perpetual lessons open to all mankind, and should be studied with a distinct and practical object. They should be viewed in their beginnings, maturity and change. They should be understood in their diversity and unity of character, each being regarded as a combination of causes, and forming a necessary element, or power, in the universal mechanism of humanity. As individuals, they exist successively and together, and pass through the various relations of want and plenty, of weakness, strength and independence, subserving the beneficent purposes of Deity, and leaving their indestructible results to be gathered and continued by the races which are to follow them.

It is a remark of Hume, that "those who cast their eye on the general revolutions of society will find that, as almost all improvements of the human mind had reached nearly to their state of perfection about the age of Augustus, there was a sensible decline from that point or period, and men thenceforth relapsed gradually into ignorance and barbarism."

With all deference be it said, such views are calculated to mislead. They indicate haste, carelessness, or a defective philosophy. To suppose that barbarism necessarily follows the highest state of improvement of which the human mind is capable, would be fatal to the admission of the fundamental and acknowledged principles of progress. It is a superficial view of the subject, and the error arises from failing to distinguish between the real and apparent aspects of society. He commits an error both in fact and in philosophy. He asserts the perfection of a very imperfect people, and assumes the fact as the ultimate cause of barbarism. The contrary proposition is more in accordance with the nature of man and the teachings of history; for nations decline in consequence of their ignorance and imperfections, their periods being limited or extended according to the degree of their obedience to the natural laws. The dissolution of a nation is the yielding of an inferior to a superior power, and may be regarded as the transition state of man from a lower to a higher civilization. But this point has been illustrated in another place.

ENGLAND.

The beginning and the gradual growth of England afford one of the most instructive chapters in history. It particularly belongs to the subject under discussion. A territory removed from the changing turmoils and inroads of a variously populated continent; surrounded by the depths of a vast ocean, and fortified by its cliffs, and its shelving strands; possessing a soil, a

climate and a vegetation, adapted to the wants of man; a hardy people of native vigor and rude simplicity, favored by possessions which moved the ferocious spirit of the pirate, and fired the ambition of warriors, whose wild and lofty conceptions sought to command the tides and to charge the surges of the sea, — ancient Britain became a field for contest, a site for a mighty nation.¹ The isolated position of the island² exempted it from the inferior portions of the tribes of a continent, and only tempted the bold and migratory bands of adventurers from abroad. However insignificant it may seem to have been, as represented by historians, all admit that it was sufficiently important to tempt great Cæsar, — and it was confessed by the conquering army that the inhabitants of the island made a brave and formidable resistance.

At this time, it was estimated by the Romans that there were about forty tribes on the island. Each tribe had its chief, and enjoyed an independence based upon its courage and resources of physical strength. For about five hundred years, Britain remained a Roman province. During this period, it was subjected to a series of trials, calculated to develop, in an extraordinary degree, all the energies and resources of the human mind.

Ruled by a foreign power, divided among themselves, surrounded by the Picts, Scots, Welsh and Irish, and constantly liable to incursions of the Saxons, Danes and Normans, — barbarians who deemed peace disgraceful, — they were impelled alike by their domestic and foreign relations to guard against enemies from every quarter, and gradually to study and to understand the means, the safety, and the necessity of union.

It was said by Sir Benjamin Rudyard, in the British Parliament, in 1642, that England could not engage in a war as they could on the continent, for they had “to fight in a cock-pit, and were surrounded by the sea.”³ This necessity proved to be the source of national strength and deeply-marked identity to England; and the island may be regarded with more justice as the *nursery of nations* than as a *cock-pit* to fight in.”

¹ “Ninety years after the expedition of Cæsar (A. D. 36), the Britons seemed to be threatened by Caligula, at the head of an army on the coast of Gaul. But that giddy youth, intoxicated by boundless power, seeking only an occasion for one of his most insane freaks, commanded his troops to charge the ocean, and to load themselves with shells, which were the ornaments of his triumph over that boisterous enemy, on his entrance into Rome.” — *History of England*, by Sir James Mackintosh, p. 16.

It is said that Canute, in the zenith of his greatness, in the eleventh century, seated himself in a chair, in the midst of his courtiers, on the sea-shore, and, as the greatest of sea-kings, commanded the tide, which was flowing, not to advance toward him. — *Ib.*, p. 35.

² Britain was discovered to be an island A. D. 85.

³ “We must fight as in a cock-pit; we are surrounded with the sea. We have no stronger holds than our own skulls and own

The conquest of the Britons by Cæsar gave them an idea of a superior state of society, of an efficient government in unity, of national relations, of new means of warfare; and the growing importance of a ceaseless vigilance led them to adopt habits of the utmost activity, to discover new agents of power, and new means of defence. The insular situation of Britain so often tempted the commander to assume the purple, that it was called *an island fertile in usurpers*.¹

As character was advanced by the continual exercise of a prudential system, and the impulses of a rude ambition, the number of petty tribes and chiefs was reduced, and leaders of enlarged views were placed in power. The consecrated groves of the Druids, which had so long resounded with the cries of human victims, were cut down, and the cromlech gave way to an altar reared to the Lord. The Pope asserted his rule, and raised the standard of the cross; a higher religion prevailed, and Britain ceased to be a province. The Saxon with his title to nobility, the Dane with his skill and cunning, and the Norman with his pomp, power and refinements, came, at different intervals, to subdue and be subdued, and reduced to elements of the English race and character. Thus England may be traced from her ancient tribes of Britain to kingdoms, from kingdoms to the Heptarchy, from the Heptarchy to the monarchy of Egbert, from the Saxon rule to that of William the Conqueror, and thence to the contests with Scotland, Ireland and Wales, up to the period of union. Every period illustrates new strength, and a broader platform for humanity.

With William came feudalism, that schoolmaster of nations, classifying people, as teachers classify pupils, for drill and discipline.²

These several stages of advancement have been pointed out, to show how slow is the growth of a nation, how various are the causes necessary to mature its character; and with a desire to persuade the reader to turn to these periods of history, that he may see the gradual, though certain, yielding of the conservative to the democratic party.

Although Hume regards the period of the Heptarchy as a barren one, and hardly worthy to be studied, yet there is enough in it to illustrate the various principles which are ever discoverable as the active means of progress. In the history of the reduction of the kingdoms of Kent, Northumberland, East-Anglia, Mercia, Essex and Sussex, to the kingdom of Wessex, under Egbert,

ribs, to keep out enemies; so that the whole kingdom will suddenly be but one flame." — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. III, p. 80.

¹ Sir James Mackintosh.

² Feudal laws were introduced into England, to a limited extent, by the Saxons,

about A. D. 600. William the Conqueror extended the system, and divided England into sixty thousand two hundred and fifteen military fiefs, all held of the crown, the possessors of which were obliged, under pain of forfeiture, to take up arms and repair to his standard on the first signal.

the diversified causes of success are seen, and the neglects which lead to dissolution and decay. A glance at the history of the subsequent power and events of England will discover similar but more important results.

The gradual progress of knowledge leads to the conventional or revolutionary progress of rights. The sovereignty of a nation is based upon a government endowed with prerogatives for self-protection, and invested with sufficient power to secure equal rights and justice to the people.¹ These rights become classified according to the knowledge and condition of the people who are to be the subjects of them. They may be subdivided for purposes of individual aggrandizement or oppression, or with motives to security against usurpation, or centralization of power. The former subdivision takes place in periods of ignorance, when men are incapable of extended action or training, as in the times of feudalism; and the latter, when they become enlightened, and have enlarged conceptions of the great interests of humanity, and are impelled by ambitious motives to excel, or by a sense of duty to provide all requisite means for their advancement or protection.

During the reign of Alfred, England was divided into counties, the trades of building houses and ships were introduced, schools were established, learned men were invited to become residents from other countries, a code of laws was prepared providing for the trial by jury, and other improvements were attempted of a social and moral nature; but these endeavors to elevate a rude and ignorant people were but the germs of civilization, to be matured and developed in subsequent generations. Alfred stood almost alone in the great work of reform; and though his immediate successors did not apparently accomplish much, still his reign constituted an important element among the means of future advancement.

After feudalism had accomplished its work, and the people of England were fitted to become subjects of a king or citizens of a nation, they were claimed as vassals by the nobility; and hence the bloody wars of the barons against their legitimate sovereigns. It was the reluctant, though necessary yielding of numerous petty sovereignties, which were inconsistent with the sovereignty of a nation, on the basis which has been stated. Details are left

¹ In a debate in the House of Commons, 1628, on the Petition of Right, *Mr. Alford* said, "Let us look into the records, and see what they are; what is 'Sovereign Power'? Bodin saith, That it is free from any conditions. By this we shall acknowledge a regal as well as legal power. Let us give that to the king the law gives him, and no more."

Mr. Pym said, "I am not able to speak

to this question, for I know not what it is. All our petition is for the laws of England, and this power seems to be another distinct power from the power of the law. I know how to add sovereign to the king's person, but not to his power; and we cannot 'leave' to him a 'sovereign power;' for we never were possessed of it," &c. — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. II, p. 856.

to be sought from works of history. Allusion can only be made to some of the great events in the beginning, or in the results of important eras. It might be interesting to speak of the Papal controversies, of the rule and abolition of Papacy in England; of foreign invasions, of domestic wars, of assemblies resembling Parliaments, of holy leagues, of the teachings of Wickliffe, the plans and plots of Wat Tyler, Jack Cade, Guy Faux, and many other similar combinations, as affording singular and remarkable examples of party zeal and hate: but the limits of this work again admonish us to be content with a more general survey, and we proceed briefly to consider the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell.

PROTECTORATE OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

A national event is the result of a great diversity of causes. These causes are sometimes of a remote as well as of recent origin. In alluding, therefore, to the reign of Charles the First, and to the Protectorate of Cromwell, reference is made to cause and effect, or to events which stand in that relation. The arbitrary and unconstitutional government of Charles led to the bold and unconstitutional measures of Cromwell. Not that the one justifies the other, but helps to explain it.

Something may be learned by noting the peculiarities of these two men, and by following them in their public acts and influences. Charles was evidently ignorant of the people whom he was called upon to govern; no man understood them and their wants better than Cromwell. Charles was unfortunate in his advisers; Cromwell had been trained in the practical school of the democratic party, and felt confirmed in his positions of duty, not only by some of the purest patriots¹ of the nation, but by his own strong

¹ John Milton was Latin secretary to Cromwell. Sir Heneage Finch said, in Parliament (December 17, 1660,) that Milton "deserved hanging." — *Parl. Deb.*, iv., p. 162. The University of Oxford ordered the political works of Buchanan, Milton and Baxter, to be publicly burned in the court of the schools. George Buchanan was born in Scotland in 1506, and died in 1582. He was the author of the celebrated compendium of political philosophy, entitled "*De Jure Regni*," published in 1579. "It was principally composed," it is said, "with a view to instruct his royal pupil, afterward James the First of England, in what belonged to his office." In 1778 — this volume

was lent by Thomas Hollis to the Earl of Chatham, who thus acknowledges the favor: "What thanks to Mr. Hollis can be enough, for giving to read immortal Buchanan, '*De Jure Regni*,' a volume, small in bulk, but big in matter; even all the length and breadth, and depth and height, of 'that great argument,' which the first geniuses and master spirits of the human race have asserted so nobly! From him, *ceux* *fontes* *perenni*, they have all drunk; and happiest who has drunk the deepest! How due the honors paid to such a name! Freedom looks down, well pleased, upon the happy spot, to contemplate the truest of her sons, strewing the pious oak leaf over the deathless

convictions.¹ Charles was inconsiderate in his demands, and unscrupulous in the choice of means to attain his ends; Cromwell had the zeal of a sectarian, and military firmness as a politician to resist oppression, and did not hesitate to employ an available force to effect what he deemed to be for the good of a nation. Charles regarded the prerogatives of royalty as paramount to the rights of the people, and claimed a confidence in advance of performance; Cromwell counted the people as superior to the king as the source of power, and first entitled to be trusted by courtesy. Charles looked upon Parliament as a party to be gained to royalty, and Cromwell claimed it as the government of the people. Charles forgot the constitution, and became angry with his Parliament because they opposed his ill-advised requisitions; Cromwell saw no safety in a king, or in a Parliament against law, and supplanted both. Charles had given the nation ample reasons to doubt his purposes, and the value of his judgment, by a reign of injustice and oppression for above twenty years; and, during the same period, Cromwell had proved his title to considerations of confidence and respect, by a uniform course of usefulness.² If Cromwell controlled the army, whose tendencies were democratic,³ Charles controlled more dangerous men, whose counsel was subversive of the constitution. If the friends of Charles claimed support because he was king, the people favored Cromwell because he contended for their rights.⁴ If Charles saw an usurper in Cromwell, Cromwell

memory of the long-departed Buchanan." — *Cor. Earl Chatham*, iv, p. 286. Sir James Mackintosh spoke of Buchanan in the highest terms of respect. In him royalty had a democratic teacher more than a hundred years before Cromwell was born.

¹ It is said that if the government had refused to make concessions to the liberal party, before the period of his power, Cromwell had decided to sell his property and emigrate to New England. Hutchinson says, after speaking of several persons who decided, in 1635, to emigrate to Massachusetts, adds, "and many other persons of figure and distinction were expected to come over, some of which are said to have been prevented by *express order* of the King, as Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, Sir Arthur Hasterigg, Oliver Cromwell, &c." — *Hist. Mass.* VOL. I, p. 44.

If the king unconsciously provided means to secure his own death, it may be asked,

does the event afford any evidence of the divine right of kings?

² Cromwell sat in the Long Parliament for the town of Cambridge, and concurred with that assembly in restoring silenced ministers; in the impeachment of Strafford, Laud, and other civil and ecclesiastical delinquents; in putting an end to the courts of High Commission and the Star Chamber; in passing the triennial bill; and in adopting its resolutions concerning proclamations, ship-money, and the duties at the ports, &c. — *Vaughan's Cromwell*, VOL. I, p. 23.

³ See Petition of Army to Parliament. — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. III, p. 1563.

⁴ "But the bold democratic temper manifested by a large portion of the army was not content with the death of the king. During the next four months it required the most decisive measures on the part of the Parliament, and all the promptitude and

protested against the acts of a perjured king. Charles mangled the Parliament, and the army of Cromwell removed its remains. In Charles we have an example how much good a king may avoid, and in Cromwell how much good a subject may accomplish. Charles attempted to sail the ship of state on a dangerous coast, without a responsible pilot, involved in a mutiny of factions; ¹ Cromwell took the helm, dropped the anchor, and waited for a new chart to sail by. Charles claimed to act as king only under the authority of God; ² Cromwell had faith in God that the people would be protected. Both were acting without the consent of the nation; but it must be considered that, while one, in violation of the oath of a sovereign, was heedless of its true interests, the other was guilty only of the assumption of power to save them. If Cromwell was "a scourge of God," ³ Charles had prepared the nation for its infliction; and if Charles was mild as a tyrant, Cromwell was moderate as a despot. Charles was beheaded to insure justice to the people; the bones of Cromwell were gibbeted to insure existence to royalty. ⁴ Both the king and Cromwell sought to be directed, in prayer, by the Divine will, though neither was inclined to obey if he could have his own. Both acted, and prayed for the people. The one signed the order to the executioner because another could not be persuaded to do it, ⁵ and the other submitted to execu-

vigor that Fairfax and Cromwell could bring to the enterprise, to suppress the mutinous detachments which presented themselves in different parts of the country." — *Vaughan's Cromwell*, VOL. I, p. 78.

"Cromwell and his officers," says Lord Clarendon, "took upon them to preach and pray publicly to their troops; and the common soldiers, as well as the officers, did not only pray and preach among themselves, but went into the pulpits in all the churches and preached to the people, who quickly became inspired with the same spirit, women as well as men taking upon them to preach, pray," &c. — VOL. V, p. 42.

"I am to tell thee, Christian reader," says Dr. Featley, — in his preface to his "Dipper Dipped," published in 1647, p. 1, — "this new year of new changes, never heard of in former ages; namely, of stables turned into temples (and I will beg leave to add, temples turned into stables, as was that of St. Paul's and many more), stalls into quires, shop-boards into communion-tables, tubs into pulpits, aprons into linen ephods, and mechanics of the lowest rank

into priests of the high places," &c. — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. III, p. 1231.

¹ *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. II, p. 660.

² *Ib.*, p. 484.

³ It was the common remark in Paris, that Mazarin, the prime minister of Louis XIV, "had less fear of the devil than of Oliver Cromwell."

⁴ Resolutions for taking up the bodies of Cromwell, &c., were passed December 8, 1660. The order, as entered in both the journals, stands thus, namely: — "Resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, That the carcasses of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, John Bradshaw, Thomas Pride (whether buried in Westminster Abbey, or elsewhere), be, with all expedition, taken up, and drawn upon a hurdle to Tyburn, and there hanged up in their coffins for some time, and after that buried under the said gallows," &c. — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV, p. 158. This order was executed January 30, 1661; and "their heads were afterward set upon poles on the top of Westminster Hall."

⁵ "Colonel," said Cromwell to Huncks,

tion, as the martyr of the people," though the people did not interpose to save him.¹ "The nation," says Macaulay, "which loved neither of the contending parties, but which was forced, in its own despite to respect the capacity and resolution of the general, looked on with patience, if not with complacency."²

But charity should be exercised towards both,—for Charles, in badly characterizing his age, and for Cromwell, in being a subject of it. Both men were surrounded by factions; both formed coalitions for power, without reference to principles; and both sought for permanent rule, and both failed of success.

And yet this age was a spring season of humanity. The seed scattered by the reformers of the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, had germinated, and began to put forth a hardy growth of principles.

The oaks of freedom had begun to drop their acorns, and the Puritans³

"it is you who must write and sign it." Huncks obstinately refused. "What a stubborn grumbler," said Cromwell. "Col. Huncks," said Axtell, "I am ashamed of you; the ship is coming into the harbor, and will you strike sail before we come to anchor?" Huncks persisted in his refusal: Cromwell muttering between his teeth, sat down, wrote the order himself and presented it to Col. Hacker who signed it without objection." — *Guizot's English Revolution*, p. 431.

¹ Just before execution, the king, in allusion to the offers formerly made to him by the army, concluded a brief speech in these words;—"Sirs, it was for the liberties of the people that I am come here. If I would have assented to an arbitrary sway, to have all things changed according to the power of the sword, I need not to have come hither; and therefore I tell you (and I pray God it be not laid to your charge), that I am the martyr of the people." — *Lingard's England*, Vol. VIII, p. 114.

² Hist. Eng. Vol. I, p. 123.

³ Dr. Burwell, in a brief speech on the "Bill for granting ease to Dissenters," discussed in Parliament, 1672-3, said, "*A Puritan was ever a rebel.*" — *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. IV, p. 574. In 1640, Dr. Chaffin

added to the litany these words: "From all lay-Puritans, and all lay Parliament-men, good Lord deliver me." The doctor having been sent for, by the sergeant-at-arms, the question was put to Parliament whether, for these words, he should be committed prisoner to the tower. The house decided in the negative, 190 against 189. It was ordered, however, that he should be called to the bar and receive a sharp reprehension and admonition, and be required to make public explanation.

"The Puritans," says Bancroft (Vol. I, p. 296), "desired permission occasionally to assemble, and, at their meetings, to have the liberty of free discussions; but the king, prompt to discover that concessions in religion would be followed by greater political liberty, interrupted the petition. 'You are aiming at a Scot's presbytery, which agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil. Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasure censure me and my council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus; then Dick shall reply, and say, Nay, marry, but we will have it thus; and, therefore, here I must once more reiterate my former speech, and say, *Le roi s'avisera*, — the king alone shall decide.' Turning to

were born to scatter them in a distant soil. The Presbyterians, with their organized strength; the Independents, breathing their lofty individuality;¹ the Baptists, asserting their rites of purity; and the Quakers, moved by a brotherly love,—came forward, each to claim the ascendancy, and all to oppose the national church and the papacy.² Resting upon the broad and holy basis of the Bible, government became the prerogative of each; man, the subject of redemption; liberty, the atmosphere of the soul; and the world, the great battle-field for victory. There seemed to be no home but in the bosom of God, no safety but in the harness prepared for a holy war, and no happiness but in the faith which each proposed, and all endeavored to establish and promulgate. What elements for society, what pioneers for progress, what instruments to be tuned and harmonized by a government, and what subjects to honor a king! Each claimed the favor and sunshine of Heaven, and all appeared to realize the strength and majestic presence of Deity. Zeal became patriotism, and toleration treason. Charity was transformed into indulgence, and hope into a wicked dream. All war was abhor-

the bishops, he avowed his belief that the hierarchy was the firmest support of the throne. Of the Puritans, he added, 'I will make them conform, or I will hurry them out of the land, or else worse, — only hang them, that's all.'

¹ The Presbyterians and Independents were nearly equally divided in Parliament, at one time. In a test vote, in the Commons, 1648, they stood fifty-seven each, and the speaker turned the scale. — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. III, p. 959.

² Another party, called "*the fifth monarchy men*," are thus noticed by Archdeacon Echard; "while the affairs of the nation seemed to be in peace and tranquillity, in the beginning of the new year 1660-1, there happened a strange and unparalleled action in London, which strengthened the belief of those secret plots and conspiracies mentioned by the Lord Chancellor." — *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV, p. 186. This was occasioned by a small body of Fifth-monarchy men, who, hating all monarchy and the appearance of it, had formerly made an attempt against Cromwell's government, but escaped beyond expectation. The head of them was one Thomas Venner, some time a

wine-cooper, who, by the king's indulgence, held a conventicle in Coleman street, where he and others used to preach to them out of the Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, and from thence drew strange inferences, persuading their congregations "to take up arms for King Jesus, against the powers of the earth, the king, the Duke of York, General Monk," &c., assuring them "that no weapons formed against them should prosper, nor a hair of their heads be touched; for one should chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight," &c., &c. They declared war against the whole world, particularly against all monarchies.

When Cromwell was accused by Major Streater — "that he intended to set up himself, and that it was a betraying of their most glorious cause, for which so much blood had been spilt," — he was defended by Harrison, who said, — "That he was assured the General did not seek himself in it, but did it to make way for the rule of Jesus, that he might have the sceptre." "Well," replied Streater, "Christ must come before Christmas, or else he will come too late." — *Guizot's Cromwell*, VOL. I, p. 304.

rent to the Quaker, but that of opinion, — all peace sinful to others, but that of conformity. A thousand kings could not control such a nation in unity, — a thousand Cromwells could not restrain the terrible volcanoes of its diversity.¹

But, in considering the period of Cromwell, the errors of isolation must not be committed. Between the identity of a nation and that of an individual there is a general similitude. Individual identity is connected with the exercise of the same faculties, during their different periods of development, in the attainment of skill and knowledge. The identity of a nation admits of the enlargement of powers already possessed, — of new powers to be acquired, as well as the practical results of a previous experience. It is of an accumulative, as well as of a distributive character. Old laws, based upon error, or rendered nugatory by change, are repealed by legislation, or by moral consent, and new laws take their place.² The new laws of a people are the true index of their progress. The great questions in regard to the rights and happiness of man are perpetual; and on most of these, nations, as well as individuals, are, and ever will be, divided. Not that the same questions are continued in a permanent form, but they arise in new propositions of a narrowed ignorance or of an enlarged philosophy. The development of principles is followed by a condition in conformity. If religious toleration be favored, it will be protected in the same degree in which it is understood. If civil liberty be appreciated, its own inherent spirit extends its sympathies and fortifies its domain. As the area of freedom is extended, its guardians and their duties are multiplied. Society is its medium, and man the form of its manifestation. Nations are the aggregates of its power, and progress the unchangeable law of its will. Thus the attainments of the few become the attainments of the many, and what is mastered by the individual is extended to the masses.

¹ Ludlow's one idea was, "that the nation should be governed by its own consent." Cromwell replied, "I am as much for government by consent as any man; but where shall we find that consent? — amongst the Prelatical, Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist, or Levelling parties?" To this question his opponent had no satisfactory answer to return, and it pointed to a difficulty which overwhelmed the republican party as soon as they began to deal with it. — *Vaughan's Cromwell*, Vol. I, p. 100. When governments fail in duty, parties become numerous. The people suffer and they are unable to explain the cause — each

class organizes a party to advance or defend their own special interests.

² The acts of Parliament were first promulgated, 16 John, 1215. For a great period of years the number of acts passed has been annually large. Between the 4th and 10th of George the Fourth, one thousand one hundred and twenty-six acts were wholly repealed, and four hundred and forty-three repealed in part. Of these acts, one thousand three hundred and forty-four related to the kingdom at large, and two hundred and twenty-five to Ireland solely. — *World's Progress*, p. 148.

Every age has its appropriate characters in men who produce and control the events of their period. Not that events endow men with sagacity, or combine fortuitously to control intelligence, but that men give birth to events characterized by their peculiar motives, aims and genius. The ages of the world are marked by the action of mind, or by the want of it. It may be an age of greatness or littleness; of strength or weakness; of activity or inertness; of virtue or vice; of piety or irreligion; of wisdom or folly; of thought or passion, or fanaticism; of knowledge or ignorance; of justice or wickedness; of government or revolution; of peace or war; of unity or diversity; of success or failure. Whatever it is — there will be found in it a correspondence of cause and effect, and whatever is produced is provided with inherent elements of conduct and control. It is to be remembered that however separately or combined these elements may appear in man or society, — individual responsibility is always the same. Cause and effect can never be separated, and the deeds of men are indissolubly linked with their consequences.

This was a period of talent, passion and revolution.¹ Conflicting opinions and plans of government arrogating an origin in Deity, and urged with a holy zeal, — made it a period of difficulty. When men assume to represent God, human wisdom is of no avail. Speaking of the Long Parliament, an intelligent writer² says, — “Never was there a greater array of talent and patriotism in an English Parliament.” Lord Clarendon admits that “there were many great and worthy patriots in the house, and as eminent as any age had ever produced.” Even Hume, apparently amazed at the impotency of royalty to withstand the popular tide, is willing to declare that.³ — “This was the time, when genius and capacity of all kinds, freed from the restraint of authority, and nourished by unbounded hopes and projects, began to exert themselves, and to be distinguished by the public. There was the celebrated sagacity of *Pym*, more fitted for use than ornament; matured, not chilled,

¹ It is admitted by Hume, that “the speeches of the parliamentary orators, during this period, are of a strain much superior to what any former age had produced in England; and the force and compass of our tongue were then first put to trial. It must, however, be confessed, that the wretched fanatism, which so much infected the parliamentary party, was no less destructive of taste and science, than of all law and order. Gayety and wit were proscribed; human learning despised; freedom of inquiry detested; cant and hypocrisy alone encouraged.” — *Hist. Eng.* VOL. v, p. 528.

Among the distinguished thinkers and authors of England of this period may be mentioned, — Milton, Harrington, Hobbes, Harvey, Clarendon, Cowley, Waller, Selden, Ainsworth, Atterbury, Barclay, Barrow, Baxter, Biddle, Boyle, Browne, Bunyan, Butler, Cudworth, Elliot, Flavel, Fletcher, Geo. Fox, Hale, Leighton, Earl of Shaftesbury, Sidney, South, Jeremy Taylor, Temple, Tillotson, Vane.

² Puritans and their principles, by Edwin Hall, p. 234.

³ *Ib.*

by his advancing age and long experience. There was Hampden, supported by courage, conducted by prudence, embellished by modesty." "There was *Selden*," we quote from Edwin Hall, "whose name will ever be considered as one of the ornaments of English history. There was Cromwell; and whatever else may be said of him, this, at least, will scarcely be disputed, that never was the sceptre of England wielded by a more vigorous or sagacious hand. His protectorship, compared with any preceding age, or with several ages succeeding, was an era of toleration, justice and law. Weakened as she was by the civil wars, England rose to respect and greatness abroad; and foreign tyrants and persecutors trembled at Cromwell's name. At one word from Cromwell, the persecutions against the Waldenses ceased.¹ The Duke of Savoy and Cardinal Mazarin gnashed their teeth with rage; but with the whole power of France at command, they durst not raise a finger more against the Waldenses while Cromwell lived. 'All Italy,' says Bishop Burnet, 'trembled at the name of Cromwell, and seemed under a panic as long as he lived. His fleet scoured the Mediterranean; and the Turks,' (who had been the terror of Europe), 'durst not offend him.' 'The men of secondary rank in that Parliament,' continues Hall, as Hetherington has well remarked, 'were possessed of talents and energy enough to have earned a high renown in any period less prodigal of human power.'

"Whoever reads the history of these times," says Prof. Smyth, "cannot well believe that this military usurper, daring and powerful as his abilities were, both in the cabinet and in the field, could possibly have succeeded, if the religious principle had not unfortunately found its way into every part of the dispute between the king and his people, and so disturbed the natural tendency of things, as to render any achievement practicable, which could well be conceived by a man of military skill and fanaticism united."²

"The government of Cromwell," says Macaulay, "though in form a republic, was in truth a despotism, moderated only by the wisdom, the

¹ The persecution of this sect in the beginning of the 13th century led to the establishment of the Holy Office or Inquisition. Pope Innocent III, had commissioned some monks to preach against the heresies of the Waldenses in Narbonne and Provence; but the Catholic bishops were at first jealous of this mission, armed as it was with great power, and the feudal chiefs refused to obey the orders of the legates, A. D. 1203-4. One of the monks, the first inquisitor, Peter Chateauneuf, having been assassinated, the aspiring pontiff called on all the neighbor-

ing powers to march into the heretical district. All obstinate heretics were placed at the disposal of Simon de Montfort, commander of this crusade, and the whole race of the Waldenses and Albigenses were ordered to be pursued with fire and sword. Neither sex, age, nor condition was spared; the country became a wilderness, and the towns heaps of smoking ruins. Such was the era of the inquisition. Dominic de Guzman was constituted first inquisitor-general, 1208. — *World's Progress*, p. 585.

² Lecture xvii, *Modern History*, p. 285.

sober-mindedness, and the magnanimity of the despot. The country was divided into military districts; those districts were placed under the command of major generals." * * "While he lived his power stood firm, an object of mingled aversion, admiration, and dread to his subjects. Few, indeed, loved his government; but those who hated it most, hated it less than they feared it. Had it been a worse government, it might, perhaps, have been overthrown in spite of all its strength. Had it been a weaker government, it would certainly have been overthrown in spite of all its merits. But it had moderation enough to abstain from those oppressions which drive men mad; and it had a force and energy which none but men driven mad by oppression would venture to encounter."

Dr. Lingard says,—“It cannot be supposed that this elevation of Cromwell to the supreme power was viewed with satisfaction by any other class of men than his brethren in arms, who considered his greatness their own work, and expected from his gratitude their merited reward. But the nation was surfeited with revolutions. Men had suffered so severely from the ravages of war and the oppression of the military; they had seen so many instances of punishment incurred by resistance to the actual possessors of power; they were divided and subdivided into so many parties, jealous and hateful of each other; that they readily acquiesced in any change which promised the return of tranquillity in the place of solicitude, danger and misery. The protector, however, did not neglect the means of consolidating his own authority.”² * * “Exposed as he was to the continued machinations of the royalists and Levellers, both equally eager to precipitate him from the height to which he had attained, Cromwell made it his great object to secure to himself the attachment of the army. To it he owed the acquisition; through it alone could he insure the permanence of his power. Now, fortunately, for this purpose, that army, composed as never was army before or since, revered in the lord-protector what it valued mostly in itself, the cant and practice of religious enthusiasm. The superior officers, the subalterns, the privates, all held themselves forth as professors of godliness.” * * “Their cause they considered the cause of God; if they fought, it was for his glory; if they conquered, it was by the might of his arm. Among these enthusiasts, Cromwell, as he held the first place in rank, was also pre-eminent in spiritual gifts. The fervor with which he prayed, the unction with which he preached, excited their admiration and tears.”³

“Some writers,” continues Dr. Lingard, “have maintained that Cromwell dissembled in religion as well as in politics; and that when he condescended to act the part of the saint, he assumed for interested purposes a

¹ *Hist. Eng.* Vol. I, p. 128, 130.

² *Ib.*, pp. 269, 270.

³ *Hist. England*, Vol. VIII, p. 206.

character which he otherwise despised. But this supposition is contradicted by the uniform tenor of his life. Long before he turned his attention to the disputes between the king and the parliament, religious enthusiasm had made a deep impression on his mind; it continually manifested itself during his long career, both in the senate and in the field; and it was strikingly displayed in his speeches and prayers on the last evening of his life. It should, however, be observed, that he made his religion harmonize with his ambition."¹

A distinguished American² utters eloquent language respecting Cromwell well worthy of attention, as it indicates a useful line of inquiry, although it does not afford a key to his mission. "I would ask," he says, "what did Cromwell, with all his military genius, do for England? He overthrew the Monarchy, and he established Dictatorial power in his own person. And what happened next? Another soldier overthrew the Dictatorship, and restored the Monarchy. The sword effected both. Cromwell made one revolution; and Monk another. And what did the people of England gain by it? Nothing. Absolutely nothing! The rights and liberties of Englishmen, as they now exist, were settled and established at the revolution in 1688. Now, mark the difference! By whom was that revolution begun and conducted? Was it by soldiers: by military genius: by the sword? No! It was the work of statesmen and eminent lawyers,—men never distinguished for military exploits. The faculty—the dormant faculty, may have existed. That is what no one can affirm or deny. But it would have been thought an absurd and extravagant thing to propose, in reliance upon this possible dormant faculty, that one of those eminent statesmen and lawyers should be sent, instead of the Duke of Marlborough, to command the English forces on the continent."

To suppose that nothing was gained by the career of Cromwell, is inconsistent with faith in human progress. The gain might not be apparent in his generation, and yet be visible in its results to the nation in succeeding periods. Whatever he attempted was done in the name of democracy³ and the Lord. If all cannot discover public benefits in his measures, no one can dispute the extraordinary power in his exertions. This is admirably pictured by Cowley, as quoted by Hume:⁴ "What can be more extraordinary," he says, "than that a person of private birth and education, no fortune, no eminent qualities of body, which have sometimes, nor shining talents of mind,

¹ Hist. of Eng., VOL. VIII, p. 271.

² John Sergeant.

³ A plan of the intended constitution, entitled, "*The Agreement of the People*," had been sanctioned by the council of officers,

and presented by Fairfax to the House of Commons, that it might be transmitted to the several counties, and there receive the approbation of the inhabitants. — *Dr. Lingard's Hist. of Eng.*, VOL. VIII, p. 125.

⁴ Hist. of Eng., VOL. V, p. 486.

which have often raised men to the highest dignities, should have the courage to attempt, and the abilities to execute, so great a design as the subverting one of the most ancient and best established monarchies in the world? That he should have the power and boldness to put his prince and master to an open and infamous death? Should banish that numerous and strongly allied family? Cover all these temerities under a seeming obedience to a parliament, in whose service he pretended to be retained? Trample, too, upon that parliament in their turn, and scornfully expel them as soon as they gave him ground of dissatisfaction? Erect in their place the dominion of the saints, and give reality to the most visionary idea which the heated imagination of any fanatic was ever able to entertain? Suppress again that monster in its infancy, and openly set up himself above all things that ever were called sovereign in England? Overcome first all his enemies by arms, and all his friends afterward by artifice? Serve all parties patiently for awhile, and command them victoriously at last? Overrun each corner of the three nations, and subdue, with equal facility, both the riches of the south and the poverty of the north? Be feared and courted by all foreign princes, and be adopted a brother to the gods of the earth? Call together parliaments with a word of his pen, and scatter them again with the breath of his mouth? Reduce to subjection a warlike and discontented nation, by means of a mutinous army? Command a mutinous army by means of seditious and factious officers? Be humbly and daily petitioned, that he would be pleased, at the rate of millions a year, to be hired as master of those who had hired him before to be their servant? Have the estates and lives of three nations as much at his disposal as was once the little inheritance of his father, and be as noble and liberal in the spending of them? And lastly, (for there is no end of enumerating every particular of his glory), with one word, bequeath all this power and splendor to his posterity? Die possessed of peace at home and triumph abroad? Be buried among kings, and with more than regal solemnity, and leave a name behind him not to be extinguished but with the whole world; which, as it was too little for his praise, so might it have been for his conquests, if the short line of his mortal life could have stretched out to the extent of his immortal designs."

The mighty power of truth, even uttered and applied by a wicked man, is not without its influence. It appears only in its grandeur and glory, when guided by integrity and wisdom. These high qualities were wanting in Cromwell, and the cause of truth went forward without the further aid of his name. His confidence in force made him blind to counsel. He had not the courage to listen to truth, nor the honesty to follow the voice of wisdom. To him no rebuke was available, no ridicule had a sting.¹

¹ These points were well illustrated in his intercourse with Sir Henry Vane.

One of the first perceptible indications of a progressive religious liberty in England was in the sixth year of the reign of William the Conqueror (1072), who, at the instigation of the Pope, summoned a national synod, to determine a dispute between the sees of Canterbury and York, respecting supremacy; and the discussion of questions of this class, and of the succession of royalty, made the chief business of the early Parliaments. The first clear account we have of the representatives of the people forming a House of Commons was in the 43 Henry III, 1258, when it was settled, by the statutes at Oxford, that twelve persons should be chosen to represent the commons in the three Parliaments, which, by the sixth statute, were to be held yearly.¹ The general representation, by knights, citizens and burgesses, took place 49 Henry III, 1265.² Church and State, in England, have always labored together. The first religious contest was between the government of England and the Church of Rome. When the rule of the pontiff ceased, parties of Protestants began to rise; and religious liberty has been discussed, in every variety of form, for more than four hundred years. The holy field for the sacred contests of men became extended by the union of Catholic Ireland and Presbyterian Scotland. The history of this sacred vein of man's nature in the three kingdoms of Great Britain is a great subject by itself, and it has been much discussed by the ablest and the purest minds. It requires but a glance, however, to see the slow but onward march of religious freedom in England. It is only necessary to read the doings of the Courts of High Commission, and to note the "test acts," "acts for abolishing diversity of opinions," "five-mile acts," "conventicle acts," "acts against occasional conformity," debates on "exclusion bills," "rights of the Catholics," and similar way-marks to be found on record, and then to look at the present toleration laws of the nation, in order to be fully convinced of the great and glorious changes which have been accomplished by the conflicts of religious zeal and controversy in England.

The liberal and conservative parties still travel together, proposing and rejecting, renouncing and adjusting; but, while each has its common centre,

When Sir Henry saw Col. Worseley enter the Parliament house followed by soldiers, by command of Cromwell, he exclaimed, — "This is not honest. It is against morality and common honesty." "Sir Henry Vane," replied Cromwell, "O Sir Henry Vane! The Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane! He might have prevented this. But he is a juggler, and has not common honesty himself." — *Dr. Lingard*, Vol. VIII, p. 192. There was no truth in this

language, and therefore no defence in it. When Vane was invited to join the new Council of State, called in the name of the Lord, he replied that "he believed the reign of the saints would now begin, but, for his, part, he was willing to defer his share in it until he should go to heaven." — *Thurloe's State Papers*, Vol. I, p. 262.

¹ Burton's Annals.

² Dugdale's Summonses to Parl., edit. 1685. — *Dict. Dates*.

and revolves, as it were, on its own axis, both have an orbit of a more extended revolution, whose centre of influence is the sun of progress,—the opening light of truth. In history are to be found the battle-fields and the landmarks of ancient defences which have been successively conquered, surrendered and abandoned, by opposing parties; and the party car of freedom, that is destined to return the soul in true life to its Maker, moving on in its illimitable track, displaying the trophies of its victories, and exposing to view the hideous remains of error, which, “to be hated, needs but to be seen.”

Civil liberty assumed a regular form in the charters, and in the Parliament, which was the first to enact laws for the people. Religious freedom precedes civil liberty. Religious and political independence are distinct conditions, and the separate results of the exercise of the different classes of faculties. We do not speak of the individual, but of the nation. The nation is trained and led by the hand of Deity, before it is placed in the keeping of intellect.

It was the early doctrine of the conservative party, that “*nations perish when they change.*”¹ When control was absolute and but little doubted, participation in government was counted a labor, and distinction conferred by arbitrary power a tax. Books were looked upon as the special property of the aristocracy, and the people knew no bill of rights but the will of the sovereign. The charter was the promise of royalty to the people. It began with simple exceptions to the rule of royal sway, by way of special favor. Favors by royal courtesy soon became rights by guarantee. Rights by agreement then were acknowledged to be rights by inheritance, and soon these rights are found secured by the laws of Parliament and by a constitution. The first great period in the history of rights was marked by their recital in the Magna Charta granted by John; the second, the beginning of the elective franchise; the third, the parliamentary power to enact laws acknowledged by the king and people; and the fourth, the colonial system, or the granting of charters to take possession of a distant territory, with certain specific and delegated powers to administer the affairs of a separate government of subservient relations.²

¹Governments perish when they change, was the remark of Cardinal Soderini to Adrian VI, who was disposed to be a reformer of abuses.

²In speaking of the ancient constitution of England, Hume says: “By the ancient constitution is meant that which prevailed before the settlement of our present plan of liberty. There was a more ancient constitution, where, though the people had, per-

haps, less liberty than under the Tudors, yet the king had also less authority: the power of the barons was a great check upon him, and exercised great tyranny over them. But there was still a more ancient constitution, namely, that before the signing of the charters, where neither the people nor the barons had any regular privileges; and the power of the government, during the reign of an able prince,

In considering the claims of the democracy on the one hand, and the reluctant concessions of the conservative party in power on the other, we are constantly impressed with the lively activity of party interest, and the unconquerable spirit of party jealousy, in the nice adjustments of new conditions. When democracy centred in the Commons, the conservatives looked for strength in the peers of the realm. When royalty and the Lords became weak, and the Commons strong, they sought a balancing power in assumed prerogatives,—Dispensing Acts, Proclamations, Monopolies; and in the “Courts of High Commission” and “Star-Chamber” it was assumed that the yielding of new privileges, which the people were fitted to enjoy and appreciate, was the supposed evil of too much freedom, and was to be remedied only by the usurpation of power. When the Commons had their seasons of comparative feebleness, and government was controlled by the irresponsible hand of arbitrary power, sustained by the corruptions of rank and wealth, then the prerogative of Parliament to grant supplies, and the energies and determination of the people to insist upon their lawful rights by new appointments and new elections, were exerted to the utmost; and the evils, which had a tongue in every form and a spirit in every soul of anguish, were abroad at noon-day and in the dread hours of midnight, in actuality, to be felt, to be seen, and to be remedied. Before, the government remedy was clothed in the forbidding habiliments of usurpation, and the supposed evils of yielding power by the few became the sufferings of the many. Now, the loathsome garments of oppression were not only to be cast off and destroyed by *repeal*, but government itself was to be clothed anew in a legitimate dress, the prerogatives of royalty reduced, the people restored to their rights, surrounded by new safeguards, and invested with a larger liberty. Thus the success of the conservative party becomes the means of abridging its own power, and the source of evidence to prove its own errors, while the success of democracy enlarges its own sphere of authority, and proves by its own acts its title to truth and sovereignty. The record of repeal proves to be the record of reform. The tests of security are to be found in the confirmations of old

was almost wholly in the king. The English constitution, like all others, has been in a state of continual fluctuation.”—Vol. iv. p. 345.

“Before the Revolution, the favorites of our monarchs were often driven away from the sovereign, fined, imprisoned, or executed; and the democratic part of our constitution, on these occasions, rushed forth (if I may be allowed the expression)

to teach the monarchical part its proper duties in its own rude and uncereemonious manner.”—*Smyth*, p. 548.

The right of granting money to the crown by the Commons has not been disputed since 1671. To this power of the popular branch a distinguished writer of England attributes “all the reforms of the constitution.”

compacts which have been gained by long-continued struggles, and by new enactments demanded by the rise of new interests.

Magna Charta had been confirmed above thirty times before the Commonwealth of Cromwell. The "Right of Petition," discussed in the early part of the reign of Charles the First, resulted in the habeas corpus act of Charles the Second.¹ The frequent suspension, without any late attempt to repeal this act, shows the settled state of the nation in respect to its acknowledged importance. The establishment of an independent judiciary and the trial by jury, as a security to the administration of justice, were marked out and gained by the democratic party, and ultimately confirmed by the intelligent and honest of all parties, as supplying the obvious wants of humanity. What the Magna Charta was to the thirteenth century, the constitution, as gathered and proclaimed at the time of the revolution of 1688, was to the seventeenth. A constitution of a nation is security to the people, as a compact between parties. It is unquestionable evidence of agreement. It may be honored by observance, or dishonored by violation. To be efficient, it must be understood and appreciated. If framed by the wisdom which comes from experience, it serves to indicate and to fortify the achievements of the past, and to secure a unity of action in the adjustment of opposite or varying interests of the future.²

The elective franchise originated among competitors for control; and what was first used by the aristocracy to gain power by contrivance, was discovered to be a right lodged by Deity in the bosom of a people. Every man invested with a capacity to seek and to ask found a title-deed within himself, and claimed to have it acknowledged and recorded as by authority.

¹ The Habeas Corpus Act, in the reign of Charles the Second, was obtained only by repeated, persevering, unwearied exertions of the Earl of Shaftesbury, after a struggle of many years. The king would have gladly vetoed the bill,—but he feared to oppose the popular will. At a subsequent period, he favored its repeal; but even the tory party from the country were almost unanimous in sustaining it.

The following anecdote is given by Burnet, and it has been extensively quoted, but not doubted. He says,—

"The Habeas Corpus Act was carried by an odd artifice in the House of Lords. Lord Gray and Lord Norris were named to be the tellers. Lord Norris, being a man subject to vapours, was not at all times attentive to what he was doing; so a very fat Lord coming in, Lord Gray counted him for ten, as a jest at first, but seeing Lord Norris had

not observed it, he went on with his misreckoning of ten; so it was reported to the house, and declared that they who were for the bill were the majority, though it indeed went on the other side, and by this means the bill was passed." VOL. I, p. 485.

Such a statement is improbable. It would place a stigma upon the friends of the bill, and a trick of such dimensions would have been discovered by its opponents. Such an act would have been a fraud, and without force as a precedent, and when known would have rendered the bill itself invalid. In the nature of things, intentional fraud can establish no law. When discovered and proved to be an imposition, the law upon such a basis becomes a nullity. Besides, this contest in the House of Lords was a severe one, and every partisan closely watched. Ferguson, in his "Growth of Popery," affirms that "this bill

The conservative party of England has disputed these titles with a two-fold power of resistance. They have denied to the ignorant the power of knowledge, and the light of truth to discover the evidence of this right, and they have yielded to its claims when proved, as yet, only a partial record and most reluctant assent.¹ A distinct and detailed history of the elective franchise and representative system, as advanced in England, would make a most instructive chapter, and tend to prove the vital importance of the democratic party to the great and growing interests of a nation.

Then, again, the same principles are strikingly illustrated in the conventional history of England,—the history of the British Parliament. The independent exercise of individual rights is one thing,—the freedom of Parliament quite another.

What has been said of the origin of elections is equally applicable to Parliaments. As elections took place before their freedom was secured, so Parliaments were summoned to assemble a long period before their independence was protected by constitutional authority. What was deemed necessary by royalty, as a defence, soon became the strong arm of government, able to resist dictation, and to frame laws. Parliaments began as the agents of power, but soon found themselves in the more exalted station of chosen guardians of the rights of the people. They began as the servants of the king, and found by degrees that they were the protectors of a nation. As this mighty power developed its growing strength, the king and the aristocracy sought to control its doings, or to crush the exercise of its authority. Here again are to be found the two great parties organized for conventional war, each forming, as it preferred, or as it was able, coalitions with the Pope, the church, or the king; the one asking a greater freedom, and the other resisting in every conceivable way, the granting of such a danger.

met with great opposition from the Lords; that it gave rise to several conferences between the two houses; and that, though it was far short of what it ought to have been, it was almost a miracle that the Lords suffered it to pass at all." This is fully confirmed by Ralph. Burnet was too much pleased with the ludicrous to be careful.

¹ The freedom of speech and the freedom of the press were early regarded as the great sources of danger by the conservative party. The want of confidence in the possession of power, without any conception of principles upon which to base it, is much like the courage of the travelling coward in the dark, who sees an enemy in every object, and an attack in every motion. As they

cannot have a light, to enable them to do the good which they intend, without exposing the evil which is in preparation, they claim darkness for defence, and ignorance for security. But the achievements of the democratic party for freedom of speech, and for the free action of that mighty engine of truth, THE PRESS, have been great and permanent. Hume says that "the liberty of the press did not even commence with the Revolution. It was not till 1694 that the restraints were taken off, to the great displeasure of the king and his ministers, who, seeing nowhere, in any government during present or past ages, any example of such unlimited freedom, doubted much of its salutary effects."—VOL. VI, p. 372.

To say nothing of the party divisions of society as marked by natural dispositions and by circumstances of condition, it is easy to see in the government of Great Britain peculiarities which favor an aristocracy, and which tend to perpetuate the conservative feeling, and to oppose the democratic.

To use the language of the Earl of Shaftesbury (1675): "You have in our English government the House of Commons, affording the sense, the mind, the information, the complaints, the grievances and the desires, of all those people for whom they serve throughout the whole nation. The people are thus secure; no laws can be made, nor money given, but what themselves, though at home, fully consent and agree to. The second estate in this government is the Lords, who are the council, the wisdom and judgment of the nation, to which their birth, education and constant employment, being the same in every Parliament, prepare and fit them. The last and supreme of all is the king,—one who gives life and vigor to the proceedings of the other two; the will and desires of the people, though approved by the wisdom and judgment of the Lords, are abortive, unless he bids them to be an act. Human reason can hardly contrive a more excellent government."

Such was the language of a member of the House of Lords when in his liberal mood, and who demanded frequent Parliaments as due to the people, and who was among the foremost to show the absurdity of the doctrine of "*the divine right of kings*." And yet it will be seen that the language is parental and conservative. Rank, prerogative and wisdom, are supposed to be combined in the King and Lords, while the people are regarded rather as the source of evidence of what is wanted, than the source of power of what is to be done.

The People, the Commons, the Lords and the King, make the governmental pyramid, said the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, of Scotland.¹ He considered the figure as emblematic of strength and permanency. So it is. But it must be a pyramid of growth, not of pre-determined structure. It must have its roots, its life-blood, and its soil. These are to growth what people are to government. The people constitute the basis, and the superstructure will be found to change according to their will. Change is but another word for growth. It is to throw off old formations, and to build up new ones. Not at the expense of parts or of proportions, nor at the sacrifice of any fundamental principle, but in conformity to laws of human progress. The King of England began as an absolute sovereign, subject to no exceptions to his rule. He is still the representative of royalty, but he has been compelled to part with most of his power.² He has divided it with the nobility, the Commons and the people, according to his fancy, judgment, or necessities. Not, at any time, for the purpose of lessening his authority, but with the obvious motives of yielding a minor power, to save a greater. So far from being the

¹ This was a remark made to the author in 1835.

² The late Duke of Sussex, in 1835, in making a comparison between the preroga-

king that he was, the dispenser of all power, he is reduced to the position of having no power,—his prerogatives making the exceptions to the rule.

The Lords are still the representatives of aristocracy ; but their subservient relations to the king in his weakness, their sickly means of increase, their doubtful standing in the affections of the people, and their fears of the Commons, are not only sources of embarrassment to such action as they may believe due to themselves, but of influences which tend rather to diminish than add to their strength, rather to lessen their importance than add to the dignity of their rank. They have long ceased to be the exclusive “wisdom and the judgment of the nation ;” and we find the titled nobility and the Right Reverend Bishops of his Majesty’s High Council “humbly”¹ asking concurrence of the Commons, during the reign of Charles the Second, nearly two hundred years ago. Even more. This branch of the government, made up by fictitious distinctions, and subject to the contingencies of ambition controlled by wealth, or weakness entailed by birth, was denominated by Pulteney, in the time of George Second, the “Hospital of Invalids ;”² and Lord Chesterfield, in his letters to his son (1766), in speaking of Pitt’s “*fall up-stairs*,” when he was made the Earl of Chatham, called the House of Lords the “Hospital of Incurables.”³ Burke, in the House of Commons (1772), did not add much to the dignity of these compliments, when he said, “The Lords do not know what is going forward in this house ; and what is worse, they do not understand the principles of the constitution.”⁴

With the metaphor of the pyramid before us, if we descend to the Commons, we find a body of men of great diversity of character, and doubtless elected to their places by the influence of high as well as questionable motives, by the influence of rank, wealth and interest. They stand professedly in direct relation to the people, or *more so* than either the King or the Lords.

The beginning of the Commons was but a nominal relation between the great men and their followers. The barons were sought by the king, the people by the barons. From an assembly which had of itself no power, and which was organized with no motive but to secure and dispense the power of others, the Commons have become the guardians of the national purse ;

tives of the King of England and the President of the United States, expressed an opinion that the President had more power than the King.—*To the author.*

¹ “An accident happened this day in the House of Commons (Dec. 21, 1660), which occasioned some merriment amongst them. The Lords sent down two messengers with some bills they had passed, with some amendments ; to which, the bearers said,

‘the Lords *humbly* desired the concurrence of that House.’ When these were withdrawn (the MS. Diary says), a hearty laughter ensued at the word *humbly*, and some moved to have it so put down in the journals, as a precedent.”—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. IV, p. 163.

² *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XII, p. 1120.

³ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XVI, p. 234.

⁴ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XVII, p. 513.

and thus the masters of the Lords and King. And yet the Commons are far from being independent. Placed between a permanent authority, which has ceased to grow in correspondence with its own power, and a constituency liable to all the inroads of bribery and corruption, its growth has been slow and the means of an independent influence variable. But it is a living body. It has ever been the chief source of life to the government, and it will prove to be the perpetual safeguard to the people. It will be continued with increased means to reform itself. As the people rise in capacity and wisdom, their strength will impart new vigor and character to the Commons. Its growing power will tend to show that an improving people cannot rest without an improving government. The pyramid will still be wanted; but if the body and apex sink, while the base increases, where shall we look to find its grandeur, or to discover its beauty?

The ceaseless sources of life that have added to the power and dignity of the Commons, the democracy of England, will in due time begin a new development. The representative system will be extended, and an hereditary monarchy will give place to an elective government.¹ When the British Colonies

¹This was written in 1851. The progress of democracy and republicanism in England, since that time, fully justifies these views. Throughout England and Scotland, it is said, there are sixty-eight republican clubs, which in one year from their inception enrolled thirty thousand men. These, by no means, represent the strength of the organization, for Mr. Bradlaugh believes that there are not far from one hundred thousand men who would vote for the change. "Besides these," says a correspondent of the New York World, "are the theoretical, philosophical, and parliamentary republicans, composed of men like Mr. Fawcett, P. A. Taylor, Moncure D. Conway." The more active, perhaps, are Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Odger, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Chas. C. Cattell, Mr. Fred. Harrison, R. Applegarth, R. A. Cooper, T. C. Cox, H. V. Mayer, and many others might be named.

At a meeting in Birmingham, May 12th, 1873, the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That a national republican organization be forthwith established for the purpose of carrying out a political programme upon which all republican or democratic societies or clubs can agree to be united." It was voted that the association thus organized, be called "The National

Republican League," and "That the objects of the League be carried out by purely legal and loyal means." The Convention was addressed by Mr. Bradlaugh, who said, "It was the first time in the history of England that from all parts of England men had been convoked in that way. Altogether there were fifty-four delegates present, gentlemen from all parts of the country,—east, west, north and south."

That it might be distinctly and openly understood that they were loyal reformers, he said, "Force was only justifiable to protect and preserve the rights they had, and not to try to win those they had not. The place for them was at the polling booth, and in the Parliament House." * * * "The republic for which they were striving was the republic which resulted from the education of the masses, until the majority understood they had political duties to perform, as well as the mere possession of their rights." This is the republicanism of democracy. To show how much still remains to be accomplished in England,—quotations are made from interesting speeches made by Charles C. Cattell, Esq., in Birmingham, and by Sir Charles Dilke, M. P., in Manchester, and placed in the Appendix. See

APPENDIX B.

are prepared for independence and nationality,—Great Britain may be in a condition to establish a republican form of government. The pyramid will then stand as a tower of strength; its parts will grow in harmony, controlling the sources of its own existence by the means of constant and unceasing renewal.

But let us look at the Commons, connected as it has been, and still is, with royalty and the Lords. It is still in the process of growth. It has been bought and sold as a slave; it has reared its head and ruled as a master.¹ The army has treated it with indignity as a prisoner, and submitted to its control as a commander. It has seen the glory and efficiency which come from unity, and has been distracted by the direful factions of diversity. It has been a monopolist, and the subject of monopoly. It has connived at treason, and denounced patriotism. It has dethroned its royal master, been the sacrifice of its own weakness, and the violator of its own laws. It has proved alternately the friend of liberty, and the instrument of oppression. Indeed, not unlike individuals, either alone or combined with others, the King, the Lords and the Commons, have had their seasons of legitimate power, patriotism, tyranny, treason and hopeless imbecility. Each, by turns, has been the subject of vehement abuse, complaint, contempt and ridicule.²

But what has the transcendent and absolute power of Parliament accomplished, in its complicated fluctuations? Everything that has rendered England happy at home, or respected abroad. The rights of the people have been defined and secured by its discussions and enactments. And, what is of immeasurable importance, it has assigned limits to the pretensions of royalty, and established precedents for correcting its own abuses. Even its weakness has been made to serve the people, and its follies have increased the activity of the common mind. We cannot sufficiently dwell upon the great and strongly marked difference between the beautiful results of a democratic policy and those of an opposite character which distinguish the conservative party. With a just legislation in view of the wants of the

¹ De Lolme says,—“In 2 Henry Fourth, the Commons claimed a right of *not* granting any supply before they received an answer to their petitions; which was a tacit manner of bargaining with the crown.”—p. 131.

² Parliaments have been characterized by every variety of name. “Long,” “Short,” “Little,” “Rump,” “Purged,” “Pensionary,” “Angelical,” “Mad,” “Diabolical,” “Doubting,” “Bat,” “Barebones,” “Praise God Barebones,” “Wonder-working,” “Weak and Heady,” “Healing and Blessed,” &c., &c.

Sir John Dalrymple says,—“It is a curious fact in the history of English liberty, that the first person who was raised by the Commons to the dignity of their speaker, was a member who had been imprisoned by Edward Third, for attacking his ministers and mistress in Parliament. From the period of that prince’s reign, the house of Commons regularly increased in consideration and power.”—*Dalrymple’s Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 15. Such a fact illustrates the beauty of the ways of Providence, and points to the reward of patriotic duty.

people, industry has been encouraged, comforts multiplied, knowledge diffused, and commerce extended. Condemned almost to a perpetual minority, the liberal party of one generation have immortalized themselves as the law-givers of the next. What democracy early proposed, truth has accomplished. The victories of toryism ended in defeat, and the defeats of democracy ended in victory. The temporary gains of the tory party have proved to be the permanent glory of the democratic.

The proudest pages of literature, science and patriotism in Great Britain, are from democratic minds. A few of the many illustrious men, who have honored democracy may be mentioned: George Buchanan, John Locke, John Milton, Sidney, Russell, Hampden, Sir Isaac Newton, Thomson, Cowper, Addison, Steele, Earl of Chatham, Lord Camden, Earl of Effingham, Col. Barré, Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Erskine, &c. A particular notice of each of these and others, will be given in a future chapter.

The democratic legislation of England is thus given by Addison: "With regard to the people," he says,—“every one must own that those laws which have most conduced to the ease and happiness of the subject, have always passed in those parliaments, which their enemies branded with the name of Whig, and during the time of a Whig ministry. And, what is very remarkable, the Tories are now forced to have recourse to those laws for shelter and protection; by which they tacitly do honor to the Whig scheme, and own it more accommodated to the happiness of the people, than that which they espouse.”¹

But our purpose is to speak more of classes of events than of the events themselves. We wish simply to point out some of the principal streams of active causes which flow to a common centre, in the ideal world, as rivers to the ocean, again to be dissipated, and again to be returned, thus yielding life and means to the unceasing progress of humanity.

We return to the period of the seventeenth century, as one of crises, transitions and offsets, and where we find the accumulated results of centuries of individual and conventional progress, in active conflict. The struggles and restrictions of royalty, the pretensions of the nobility, the rights of the people, and the birth and growth of parliament; the expanding of the church, the privileges of conscience, the exclusion of papacy, and the toleration of sects,—all these questions, and their innumerable and complicated correlatives, had been discussed with a burning zeal, which many generations had contributed to augment to an intense flame, and which were precipitated in every possible variety of shape and fragment, into this period of startling interest, when Charles the First, Oliver Cromwell, Charles the Second, James the Second and William the Third,² were made the fearful instruments of adjustment.

¹ Freeholder, No. 54.

Magna Charta,—a new Petition of Right,

² “The Bill of rights was in fact, a new —a new enrolment of the prerogatives, if I

The common mind of England was overwhelmed with the controversies connected with the church and the government, and Cromwell rose up, the controller of sects, and William the Third became the political arbiter of the people. The first revolution foreshadowed the coming might of the people; the second, the sure decay of royalty. The first prepared the way for civil and religious liberty; the second secured these blessings in a permanent form, for another period of growth. The first took down, the second built up. The former enlarged the area of freedom, the latter occupied it. The history of democracy in England is important because it is instructive. Brief chapters are given in this volume from the period of Cromwell to that of George the Third.

It would be interesting and instructive to trace democracy as developed in the Italian republics, in Germany, Spain, Russia, &c.; but the limits of this work preclude extended allusion to these nations. They will be noticed incidentally in future chapters, as affording illustrations of principles.

Thus the author has endeavored to give a brief view of principles, as a necessary introduction to the work which is proposed. It is designed simply as a suggestive sketch, imperfect it must be confessed, but made in the hope that it will prove an humble aid to the reader in considering the important topics which are to follow. Such a review of the past appeared to be imperatively demanded by the nature of the undertaking, in order that the student might with more clearness understand the origin of national causes, and be able to follow them out in their consequent relations, so widely displayed in the events of the world. The author's aim is that of inquiry; and while he may fail to present new views, or prove to be the unfortunate instrument of distorting old ones, it is possible that he may be the means of inducing some attention to important facts, or subjects, and of inciting the activity of more gifted minds to pursue a further investigation, and thus give birth to works of wider range, clearer views, and of more extended erudition.

VOX POPULI EST VOX DEI.¹

There is a sacred feature of the subject, as made visible in the Providence

may so speak, of the democratic part of the constitution,—which, though consented to by William, an elected prince, and perhaps even thought necessary to his own justification and security, could only have been extorted by force from any reigning hereditary monarch; and in point of fact, was certainly not procured by the English nation, on this occasion, till the regular possessor of the crown had ceased to wear it, and till the

country had appeared in a state of positive and successful resistance to his authority.” —*Smyth's Modern Hist.*, p. 352.

¹ This proverb was quoted by William of Malmesbury, early in the twelfth century. There is a Chinese saying of the same meaning, but in more emphatic language, uttered more than 1200 years B. C.: “Heaven's views may be ascertained from our people's views.”

of God, and expressed in the ancient maxim,—*Vox populi est vox Dei*, which is entitled to thoughtful notice and consideration.

In the time of James Second, 1688, a great number of the nobility and gentry at Nottingham, signed and published a protest against the illegal acts of the King,—which thus concludes: "They indeed, owned it rebellion to resist a King that governed by law; but he was always accounted a tyrant that made his will his law; and to resist such an one they justly esteemed no rebellion, but a necessary defence: and on this consideration, they doubted not of all honest men's assistance, and humbly hoped for, and implored the Great God's protection, that turned the hearts of people as pleased him best; it having been observed, that people could never be of one mind without his inspiration, which had in all ages confirmed that observation, "*Vox populi est vox Dei*."

Extreme and timid partisans, whose opinions are overruled by private interest, or by passions of the people, or whose impatience does not enable them profitably to study the teachings of time, are often disposed to doubt this democratic maxim. In the reign of George Second, (1753), *Sir Roger Nudigate*, in the House of Commons, complained that the whigs of that day were not in agreement with the whigs of former times. He said,—“Among their ancestors the established maxim was, ‘*Vox populi est vox Dei*’; but their posterity of this age have in this preamble¹ told us that ‘*Vox populi est vox Diaboli*,’ as it must be, if it be directed by artful and wicked men.”² Thus qualified, Sir Roger was safe in his language, but this cannot be said of all who are inclined to reflect upon the ultimate judgment of the people.

In this connection, the remarks of *Froude*, in his lectures on the times of Erasmus and Luther,—may help to elucidate this subject. He says,—“In the sciences the philosopher leads; the rest of us take on trust what he tells us. The spiritual progress of mankind has followed the opposite course. Each forward step has been made first among the people, and the last converts have been among the learned.

“The explanation is not far to look for. In the sciences there is no temptation of self-interest to mislead. In matters which affect life and conduct, the interests and prejudices of the cultivated classes, are enlisted on the side of the existing order of things, and their better trained faculties and larger acquirements, serve only to find them arguments for believing what they wish to believe.

“Simple men have less to lose; they come more in contact with the realities of life, and they learn wisdom in the experience of suffering.

“Thus it was, that when the learned and the wise turned away from Christianity, the fisherman of the Galilean lake, listened, and a new life

¹ Preamble of the Jews' Naturalization Bill. ² P. D., Vol. xv, p. 133.

began for mankind. A miner's son converted Germany to the Reformation. The London artisans and the peasants of Buckinghamshire, went to the stake for doctrines which were accepted afterward for a second revelation.

"So it has been ; so it will be to the end. When a great teacher comes again upon the earth, he will find his first disciples where Christ found them and Luther found them."¹

The cause of democracy rests upon the immutable basis of eternal truth. Man is acknowledged to be the responsible agent of power, and the subject of the exalted relations of thought, freedom and holiness. He is invested by his Maker with those attributes of instinct and discernment which give perpetuity to the race, safety to the nation, and dignity to the objects of life. Religion has been admirably characterized by M. Dumas as "THE NURSE OF THE PEOPLE." This is a sentiment of transcendent truth and beauty. It is proved by innumerable facts, which may be found in history, and may be seen magnificently illustrated in the constantly transpiring events of nations.

In all ages of the world, and among all the tribes and nations of the earth, the rule of Deity has been acknowledged above every other power, and superior to every other principle.² We do not speak of its form of manifestation, nor shall we presume to fathom Infinite Wisdom in the control of the mysterious agents by which its power is exerted. These are questions too vast for the feeble capacities of the human mind. It is not for us to draw the line between good and evil, as done by man, and seen by God ; to elevate the king, and crush the peasant ; to exalt the philosopher, and proscribe the savage ; to rank the Christian and exclude the pagan, as the means of progress, or as the obstacles of universal improvement. It is not for us to sit in judgment on the inward workings of the soul, to dictate its flights, to question its prerogatives, or to measure its unseen dominions. It is not for us to scan the sublime and ultimate destinies of nations, nor the fearful wonders of Providence, which overrule a Pharaoh, educe love from the hate of a Pilate, and transmute the wickedness of rulers into dispensations that bless a people or advance a world. These are themes to be contemplated as we look upon a balanced universe, poised by the Almighty hand that made it to be seen only in the trackless visions of speechless wonder, but not to be comprehended by the philosophy of a finite mind.

What more can the creature ask than an all-pervading love, that sustains a bounteous world, and opens to the growing mind of man the golden flood-gates of ineffable light, truth and beauty ! That, while it permits desola-

¹ Short Studies on Great Subjects, p. 126.

² Cicero says : "I never thought any religion to be despised : I have always considered the foundation of our state to be

laid in religious institutions ; and that, without the fear of Heaven, the republic would never have arrived to its present flourishing condition."—*Cicero De Natura Deorum*, Lib. III.

tion, points to new sources of joy ; that, while it gives "rain and sunshine" to the oppressor, adds new energies to the spirit of freedom ; that, while it submerges the common mind in the darkness of ignorance, inspires an unquenchable thirst for knowledge ; that, while the wicked are permitted to rule, girds the righteous with invincible strength ; and that, while it has darkened the disk of its glory with the conditions of death, has opened new and inexhaustible fountains of life, and placed within the reach of man the means of happiness, and within the reach of nations the means of freedom.

Whether men follow counsels which free them from slavery, or take them from freedom, they are the continued subjects of divine care. A righteous people may dethrone a wicked king, or a self-elected ruler may rise up to scourge a wicked people,—whatever and whichever the events may be, the popular voice is either hushed in meek submission to the sway of superstition, a state of zeal and of ignorance, or speaks with the thundering tones of enlightened confidence in the justice of God, and in the freedom of man.

The Israelites became the followers of Moses because he was the servant of the Lord. Jesus of Nazareth was worshipped by the shepherds of Bethlehem because he was the Son of God, and the cross has become the sacred emblem of unconquerable might. The Egyptians began their history with dynasties of gods and heroes, and the government of Persia was based upon the teachings of the sacred book. The Titans, a band of adventurers from Phœnicia, became the sacred teachers of the ancient Greeks. Lycurgus had no confidence in his own powers of persuasion to induce the Spartans to conform to his government, without the aid of the Delphian Oracle.¹ Pisistratus had no hope in usurpation, but by counterfeiting the gods ; and Hippias could be dethroned only by bribing them. Plato says "that his countrymen derived all their knowledge of divine things from the ancients, who, as he affirms, were wiser, and lived nearer to the gods." Alexander the Great claimed to be a descendant of Jupiter, and gained a control over the Egyptians by acknowledging an affinity between their deities and those of Greece. The Roman Senate was looked upon with religious awe, because it was believed to be the medium of supernatural power ; and the tribunes became invested with the same agency, but to serve the people and enlarge their liberties.² The Pope

¹The Delphian Oracle, tutored, it may be supposed, to the purpose, declared Lycurgus the friend and favorite of the gods ; and proclaimed to Sparta that from him she should derive the most perfect government on earth.

²The tribunes were elected annually, like the consuls. At first, they were five in number ; but afterwards their number was increased to ten. They had the power of suspending, by a single *veto*, the execu-

tion of any decree of the senate which they judged prejudicial to the people. They were not allowed, however, to interfere in the deliberations of that body, nor permitted ever to enter the senate-house. The persons of these magistrates were declared sacred ; but their authority was confined within the bounds of the city and a mile beyond the walls. The division of such a power with the people, in any degree, was an important concession on the part of the senate.

claimed to act in accordance with a charter from Heaven; and Pepin and Charlemagne, of France, joined with the Sovereign Pontiff to secure the civil and religious rule of nations.¹ The Benedictines² of Italy were revered by kings, and the powerful possessors of wealth, as the representatives of Deity, and were regarded as the mediators between man and his Maker. The ancient Britons bowed to the ferocious rule of the Druids; the Anglo-Saxons to that of the Cross; and when the Duke of Normandy was prepared to invade England, he was joined by the power of the Holy See of Rome, and we find his warriors at prayers to the God of nations to command the elements, and to bless his arms.³ The Sultan of Turkey swears to govern according to the injunctions of Mahomet, because he is believed to be the only teacher from Heaven; and the emperors of the Celestial Empire have no influence, except as they are believed to be the representatives of Deity.

¹ Pepin sent an embassy to Rome, to Zachary the Pope, proposing it as a question to his Holiness whether he or Childeric had the best title to the throne. Zachary had formed the scheme of erecting a temporal dominion in Italy, and wished, for that purpose, to employ the arms of France to wrest the kingdom from the Lombards. An opportunity now offered of securing the friendship of Pepin. The Pope decided the question by declaring that it was conducive to the honor of God, and the interests of the church, that Pepin, who already exercised the office of king, should possess the title also.

Charlemagne frequently visited Italy, both to establish his own power in that country, which was endangered by the partisans of the descendants of the Lombard kings, and to defend the authority of the popedom, which was firmly devoted to his interests.—*Tytler*, VOL. II, pp. 59, 73.

² Benedict, the founder of this order, was an Italian by birth. He had studied at Rome, and soon distinguished himself by his talents, as well as superior sanctity. While quite young, he retired to a cave, at Subiaco, where he remained for some years. Some neighboring hermits chose him for their head, or superior; and the donations which they received from the devout and charitable, very soon enabled them to build a large monastery. The reputation of Benedict increased daily; and he began to perform miracles, which at-

tracted the notice of Totila, the Gothic King of Italy.

³ The Norman fleet and army had been assembled, early in the summer, at the mouth of the small river Dive, and all the troops had been instantly embarked; but the winds proved long contrary, and detained them in that harbor. The authority, however, of the duke, the good discipline maintained among the seamen and soldiers, and the great care in supplying them with provisions, had prevented any disorder, when at last the wind became favorable, and enabled them to sail along the coast till they reached St. Valori. There were, however, several vessels lost in this short passage; and, as the wind again proved contrary, the army began to imagine that Heaven had declared against them, and that, notwithstanding the Pope's benediction, they were destined to certain destruction.

These bold warriors, who despised real dangers, were very subject to the dread of imaginary ones; and many of them began to mutiny, some of them even to desert their colors, when the duke, in order to support their drooping hopes, ordered a procession to be made with the relics of St. Valori, and prayers to be said for more favorable weather. The wind instantly changed; and, as this incident happened on the eve of the feast of St. Michael, the tutelar saint of Normandy, the soldiers, fancying they saw the hand of Heaven in all these circumstances, proceeded with the greatest alacrity.—*See Hume*, VOL. I, p. 146.

It has been said that the clergy, in the dark ages, discovered the power sought to be exerted by Archimedes,—the aid of another world to move the one they lived in. But this power is always present, though clothed in the varying forms of a progressive condition. Whether we follow it in the mighty gatherings at Placentia, or in the moving multitudes led on by Peter the Hermit, and by kings in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the infidels;¹ whether we embark with the spirit of a Columbus, or a Cortez, a Pizarro, or with the Pilgrims in the Mayflower,—we can find no people bold enough to challenge its authority,—no people strong enough to withstand its rule. Indeed it is the only rule universally acknowledged by man, although sometimes opposed by his wisdom. A change of religious belief is but a change of form, and not of principle. Superstition is but religious zeal without knowledge, and error but the evidence of ignorance of the practical uses of knowledge.

The religious principle in man is as mighty in its sway as it is indestructible in its nature. Its existence does not depend upon the feeble enactments of nations, nor upon the persuasive powers of its ministers. These are but the humble instruments of its development. With its presence and power, the world becomes a field of indescribable interest and glory; but, in its absence,—could the mind be withered to such a thought,—the world would cease to be a place of being, and man would fall to the senseless level of chaotic matter.

It is the breathings of democracy, as taught by the Bible, that have sub-

¹ "Peter, commonly called the Hermit, a native of Amiens, in Picardy, had made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Being deeply affected with the dangers to which that act of piety now exposed the pilgrims, as well as with the instances of oppression under which the eastern Christians labored, he entertained the bold, and, to all appearance, impracticable project, of leading into Asia, from the furthest extremities of the west, armies sufficient to subdue those potent and warlike nations which now held the holy city in subjection. He proposed his views to Martin Second, who filled the papal chair, and who, though sensible of the advantages which the head of the Christian religion must reap from a religious war, and though he esteemed the blind zeal of Peter a proper means for effecting the purpose, resolved not to interpose his authority till he saw a greater probability of success. He summoned a council at PLACENTIA, which consisted of four thousand ecclesiastics and thirty thousand seculars,

and which was so numerous that no hall could contain the multitude, and it was necessary to hold the assembly on a plain. The harangues of the Pope, and of Peter himself, representing the dismal situation of their brethren in the east, and the indignity suffered by the Christian name in allowing the holy city to remain in the hands of infidels, here found the minds of men so well prepared, that the whole multitude suddenly and violently declared for the war, and solemnly devoted themselves to perform this service, so meritorious, as they believed it, to God and religion."—*Hume*, VOL. I, p. 227.

The subject of the crusades is an important one, and will be noticed and considered in future chapters. The *first* was commenced in 1096; the *second* in 1147; the *third*, (by sea) in 1189; the *fourth* in 1202; the *fifth*, (by sea) in 1217; the *sixth*, (two expeditions) in 1238; the *seventh*, in 1245; the *eighth*, and last, in 1270, and ended in 1291.

jected that sacred book to the indignity of guards and proscriptions. The Bible has given power to the popes and priests, and freedom to the people. It prepared the Puritans for religious liberty, and the people of the American colonies for independence.¹ When we contemplate, in the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, the beginning of a mighty nation; their confidence in God and liberty, their struggles, hardships and sufferings, their jealous vigilance of rights, and their visions of growth and greatness,—we may hear, in the prayers and exhortations which were echoed in the wilderness, the divine proclamation, “**THAT THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE IS THE VOICE OF GOD.**”

If we follow the growth of the colonies, and trace their sources of strength, diversities of power, stability of purpose, wonderful foresight of danger, strength of endurance, means of protection, love of freedom, and uncompromising spirit to defend it, we cannot fail to see, in the birth of WASHINGTON,² and in his elevation to power; in the birth of Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Joseph Hawley, John Hancock, and the sacred band of their associates,—endowed as they were with extraordinary powers of discernment, prudence and courage,—another illustration of the glorious truth, **THAT THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE IS THE VOICE OF GOD.**

If we leave the infant republic in charge of the patriot who fought its battles and achieved its independence, and turn to behold the mighty nation that it has become, by the unconquerable spirit and wise administration of democracy; and to contemplate the hope in humanity which it has inspired, we are again led to acknowledge and to admire the beauty and exalted force of the sacred maxim, **THAT THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE IS THE VOICE OF GOD.**

¹ A Bible Society was constituted in Russia, 23d January, 1813, and had for its president, under the protectorship of the emperor, Prince Alexander Galitsin, minister of religious worship and public instruction. The activity of the society was very great. Its seat was at St. Petersburg; but it had, moreover, throughout the whole extent of the empire, 289 committees or auxiliary societies. Donations amounted to 3,711,109 roubles. It caused the scriptures to be translated and printed, or at least to be circulated, in 41 idioms, of those which are spoken in Russia, apart from the national Slavonic language, especially by the numerous Finnish and Ural tribes. It distributed 448,109 copies. In 1825 it printed 70,000 more. It was soon found, however, to encourage the spirit of democracy; and,

on the 24th of April, 1826, an ukase, enacting the suppression of the Russian Bible Society, proceeded from the supreme authority.—*Court and Government of Russia*, by J. H. Schnitzler, Vol. II, p. 489.

² What a sublime democratic triumph does the following correspondence indicate! The ruins of an Empire to perpetuate the glory of a Republic; the recognition of peace as identical with democracy,—and a voluntary tribute of the Supreme Pontiff to aid in rearing a monument in honor of the achievements of the people!

“*Legation des Etats Unis-d’ Amer-
ique, pres le Saint Siege, Rome,* }
Dec. 24, 1851.

“**SIR:** I have the honor to inform you that I have been apprized by his Holiness

It was a conception of the poet, of great and fearful import, that

"An undevout astronomer is mad;"

and, with a similar conviction and feeling in respect to the magnitude of the subject which this work is intended to elucidate, we cannot but add, that, whoever has studied man in the true dignity of his nature, or the sublime destiny of nations, without becoming a friend to democracy; or, whoever has studied democracy without realizing the elevating emotions of adoration to his Maker, has failed to discover the paramount objects of life, and the most exalted privileges which inhere in the exercise of the rights of a true citizen.

the Pope, through Cardinal Antonelli, the Secretary of State of the Roman government, of his intention to contribute a block of marble toward the erection of the national monument to the memory of Washington. The block was taken from the ancient Temple of Peace, adjoining the palace of the Cæsars, and is to receive the inscription of 'Rome to America.' As soon as the work is completed, the necessary measures will be taken to forward it to you.

"I am, sir, very respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"LEWIS CASS, JR."

Addressed to the Secretary of the National Monument Society, Washington, D. C.

"Washington, Feb. 4, 1851.

"SIR: Your letter of the 24th of December last, informing me that you had been 'apprized by His Holiness the Pope, through Cardinal Antonelli, the Secretary of State of the Roman government, of his intention to contribute a block of marble towards the erection of the national monument to the memory of Washington,' has been laid before the Board of Managers of the Washington National Monument Society of this city, and they have instructed me to communicate, through you, to his Holiness the Pope, their sincere gratification at the information thus furnished of his intention to contribute a block of marble from the ruins of the Temple of

Peace, at Rome, to be placed in the monument now in the course of erection in honor of the illustrious Washington.

"I am requested to assure you that it will be not only interesting, but acceptable as an offering from 'Rome to America;' and especially so as forming a part of an ancient structure, dedicated to peace, in the vicinity of the Palace of the Cæsars, to be placed in juxtaposition with blocks of stone which have been presented by the modern and free States of the American confederacy. It will be regarded as a manifestation of respect paid to patriotism and private virtue, to the name and character of one whom the civilized world holds in the highest estimation, and to a nation whose annals he has rendered glorious.

"The monument now in course of erection will, it is believed, from its magnificence, do honor to the great patriot and statesman, as well as to his countrymen, by whose voluntary contributions it is to be erected.

"The Board of Managers respectfully request you to tender their thanks to his Holiness for his very acceptable contribution, and to inform him that it shall be placed in a conspicuous position in the monument.

"I have the honor to be,

"Very respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"GEO. WATTERSTON, *Secretary*.

"LEWIS CASS, JR., United States Chargé d' Affaires, Rome."

The triumphs of DEMOCRACY constitute the way-marks of the world. They demand no extraneous element of endurance for permanency, no fictitious splendor for embellishment, no borrowed greatness for glory. Originating in the inexhaustible sources of power, moved by the spirit of love and liberty, and guided by the wisdom which comes from the instincts and experience of the immortal soul, as developed in the people, DEMOCRACY exists in the imperishable principle of progress, and registers its achievements in the institutions of freedom, and in the blessings which characterize and beautify the realities of life. Its genius is to assert and advance the true dignity of mind, to elevate the motives and affections of man, and to extend, establish, protect and equalize, the common rights of humanity.

AMERICAN COLONIES.

POLITICAL HISTORY.

POLITICAL HISTORY is the record of events in their relations as national causes. Its objects are to discover the sources of national prosperity, and the instrumentalities by which that prosperity has been achieved, whether by party or otherwise. The end of such a study obviously consists in a just application of principles as developed by a common experience. It comprehends man as a being of intelligence, principles as the standard of action, laws and institutions as the exponents of practice, governments as the agents of power, and nations as aggregated results. A rudimental key to the subject is to be found in a knowledge of the faculties of the human mind.¹ Let

¹ So constituted is the mind of man, that his views enlarge, and his desires and wants increase, in full proportion to the facilities afforded for their gratification; and, indeed, with augmented rapidity, so that no sooner has the successful exercise of his powers accomplished any considerable simplification or improvement of processes subservient to his use or comfort, than his faculties are again on the stretch to extend the limits of his newly acquired power; and having once experienced the advantages which are to be gathered by availing himself of some of the powers of nature to accomplish his ends, he is led thenceforward to regard them all as a treasure placed at his disposal, if he have only the art, the industry, or the good fortune, to penetrate those recesses which conceal them from immediate view. Having once learned to look on knowledge as power, and to avail himself of it as such, he is no longer content to limit his enterprises to the beaten track of former usage,

but is constantly led onward to contemplate objects which, in a previous stage of his progress, he would have regarded as unattainable and visionary, had he even thought of them at all. It is here that the investigation of the hidden powers of nature becomes a mine, every vein of which is pregnant with inexhaustible wealth, and whose ramifications appear to extend in all directions wherever human wants or curiosity may lead us to explore. These remarks of Herschel on "*the general nature and advantages of the study of the physical sciences*," suggest a method of study quite as applicable to other topics. Between the developments of mind and the growth of nations there is an instructive correspondence of cause and effect. "Those processes of human agency advance most happily to their consummation," says Baron Humboldt, "which most faithfully resemble the operations of the natural world."—*Sphere and Duties of Government*, p. 4.

the mind be studied. The events first to be considered, in the political history of the United States, are those which happened in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which led to the colonization of the American continent. But, in order that we may have distinct views of national formations, let us first endeavor to understand the principles of colonization.

THE PRINCIPLES OF COLONIZATION.

The world of truth pervades eternity. God is its centre, humanity the means of its development. To man is given the double power of an inward and outward vision. He can look upon the events of the past, reproduced by the memory of the reflective powers;¹ gather the results of an experience, which spring from a life, a generation, or from the aggregate ages already transpired. He can look forward with an eye of hope that is illumined by a living faith, aided by the knowledge which shapes conviction, by the light of revelation which insures immortality, and by the sentiments of the soul which elevate the mind to the great objects of existence, and prepare it for the untrodden paths of the future.

Men limit the sources of influence to the narrow circle of individual existence, and live content under the control of selfish purposes; or they exert the powers of a higher nature, seeking a further knowledge, a superior good, a wider sphere, a sublimer philosophy.

The inward view is reflection. It refines and perfects whatever has been observed and realized. It is the reviewing or comparing power of the mind. It compounds, compares and divides the elements of knowledge, and theorizes from a consciousness that comprehends the present and the past. With gifted minds the faculties of reflection systematize knowledge, develop principles, and advance science.

The outward view is perception. It is the mind looking out from itself, inspired by its instincts, and directed by its capacities, hopes and aspirations. With a comprehensive glance at the common experience of the past; with a lively sense of an advancing age, of new wants and present duties, the perceiving mind explores the future, and, with its clear conceptions of what is possible, leads the way to new discoveries, and illustrates the means of their attainment. The separate exercise of the reflective faculties makes the abstract student. The separate exercise of the perceptive faculties makes the speculative pioneer. Between the two extremes is to be found the variety of character which makes up the world. Added to these sources of mental activity, are to be found the impelling forces of moral and religious sentiment, combined with an unyielding adherence to self-

¹ Not memory as defined by philosophers of or Reid,—but by the more practical system the Peripatetic school, or by Plato, Locke, of metaphysics of Spurzheim.

imposed convictions, and guarded by propensities, which accumulate a power necessary to advancement, and secure a control necessary to protection.

Bacon¹ and Franklin were pioneers of knowledge, combining with wonderful power and simplicity, the results of the past with new provisions for the future. In Newton² and La Place³ are seen those great teachers so reverently invoked by Virgil,⁴ but who came not till Naples had been honored by the dust of the illustrious poet for more than sixteen hundred years.⁵ In view of modern times, the fifteenth century was made glorious by the great pioneer of Discovery,⁶ and the seventeenth by the immortal pioneers of Democracy.

¹ Lord Bacon was the first who taught the proper method of studying the sciences; that is, he pointed out the way in which we should begin and carry on our pursuit of knowledge, in order to arrive at the truth. As, in a great army, there are some whose office it is to construct bridges, to cut paths along mountains, and to remove various impediments, so Lord Bacon may be said to have cleared the way to knowledge, to have marked out the road to truth, and to have left future travellers little else to do than follow his instructions. He was the miner and sapper of philosophy, the pioneer of nature; and he eminently promoted the dominion of man over the material world. He was born in the year 1561. Before his time the scholastic philosophy of Aristotle prevailed.—*British Library of Useful Knowledge*.

² Sir Isaac Newton was born in 1642 (O. S.) He died in 1727. He was of obscure origin, and employed when young as a market-boy. He was a democrat, and was twice elected a member of Parliament. He was a candidate a third time for a place in Parliament, but his democracy was adverse to his re-election.

³ La Place was the son of a farmer, and was born in 1729. He died in 1827. By the time he was twenty-one years of age he had mastered the discoveries of all the philosophers who preceded him, and was prepared to build on them a splendid superstructure of his own.

⁴ As rendered by DRYDEN:

"Ye sacred Muses with whose beauty fired,
My soul is ravished, and my brain inspired,

Whose priest I am, whose holy fillets wear;
Would you your poet's first petition hear,—
Give me the ways of wandering stars to know,
The depths of heaven above, and earth below;
Teach me the various labors of the moon,
And whence proceed the eclipses of the sun;
Why flowing tides prevail upon the main,
And in what dark recess they shrink again;
What shakes the solid earth, what cause delays
The summer nights, and shortens winter days."

⁵ Virgil was born at Mantua in the first consulship of Pompey the Great, 69 B. C. He died in the fifty-first year of his age.

⁶ Columbus was the son of a Genoese Pilot; a pilot and seaman himself; and at one period of his career was compelled to beg his bread at the doors of the convents in Spain. "But he carried within himself," says a distinguished writer, "and beneath a humble exterior, a spirit for which there was not room in Spain, in Europe, nor in the then known world; and which led him on to a height of usefulness and fame, beyond that of all the monarchs that ever reigned." All Europe was awakened by the discoveries of Columbus, and the family of the Cabots was among the warmest in insisting on further maritime adventure. There was a romance in the idea of discovering unknown realms. The world was to be enlarged; every kingdom of nature was to be more productive. Enthusiasm pervaded all classes. Sebastian Cabot, who was just arrived at manhood, after alluding to the feelings of his countrymen, said, "By this fame and report, there increased in my heart a great flame of desire to attempt some notable thing."—*Life of Cabot (Sparks' Series), by Hayward*.

Honor to the pioneer! He is entitled to reverence as the early agent of Providence in all those great changes of life which constitute the improvement of the world. We speak of the pioneer in an enlarged sense,—as the discoverer of new regions, new agents, new beauties, and new combinations in the natural, as well as new truths in the moral world. He seems to be endowed with an instinct superior to reason, a gift from his Maker to extend the limits of knowledge, and the great purposes of divine beneficence.

We find him in the wilderness, self-exiled from the refinements of civilization, inviting labor, enduring hardships, incurring dangers, a willing neighbor to the savage.¹ He is to be found upon the ocean, in the frail-constructed bark, without instructions from man, ploughing the trackless deep, with no chart of his destined shores but that of faith. Behold him in the icy regions of the poles, though aided by the light of science, yet still the same unyielding and self-sacrificing spirit, reaching forward to burst the boundaries of his view. See him in the laboratory and in the work-shop, in the observatory and in the field. He is to be heard in the pulpit and in the halls of legislation, and read in the public prints. He is to be found in the caverns of the earth, in the depths of the sea, in the vaults of the ancients, in the crater of the volcano, on the summit of the loftiest mountain, in the lightning flashes of the cloud,² and borne by the chariot of science and art above and beyond the tempests of the sky. Behold him, too, in the missions of the gospel to distant lands; see him struggling in the cause of freedom, earnest and bold in all reforms, and a ministering angel of sympathy in the cause of suffering humanity. Every age has had its great and shining lights, suited to its period, and every nation its gifted spirits.³

The colony⁴ is the offspring of the mind in its outward view. Without a disposition to leave his native soil, man would accomplish but a small por-

¹ The celebrated Daniel Boone, at the age of fifty-two years, having seen some adventurers returning from an expedition up the Missouri, who described the country bordering on that river in glowing colors, resolved once more to seek a new home in the solitude of Missouri. Being inquired of as to what induced him to leave all the comforts of home, and so rich and flourishing a country as his dear Kentucky, which he had discovered and helped to win from the Indians, for the wilds of Missouri,—"Too crowded! too crowded! I want more elbow-room," he replied. This was in 1798. He died in 1818. Lord Byron says of him:

"Of all men, saving Sylla, the Man-slayer,
Who passes for in life and death most lucky

Of the great names which in our faces stare,
The General Boone, backwoodsman of Kentucky,
Was the happiest among mortals any-where;
For, killing nothing but a bear or buck, he
Enjoyed the lonely, vigorous, harmless days
Of his old age in wilds of deepest maze."

² The most distinguished pioneers of the world in discovering the laws of electricity are Franklin, Professors Morse and Joseph Henry. The first discovered its true nature and agency; the second labored to show the practicability of its useful application,—and the third to point out the means of its accomplishment, in the successful telegraph.

³ Republic U. S. By the author.

⁴ Colony (in Latin *Colonia*, a word derived from the Latin verb *colo*, *colere*, to till or cultivate the ground) originally signified

tion of his appointed work. The earth would become a superfluous wilderness, inventive genius would seek in vain for objects of activity, and the dexterous hand would be trained to no skill. Population would become so dense as to smother endeavor, production would stagnate, and industry could promise no reward. Enterprise would react upon enterprise, as the reverting stream destroys the water-fall; and the activity of man would increase his wants, and lessen his power to supply them. Mental vigor would be dissipated by the sameness of action, the love of gain would degenerate into rapacity, and society in its natural ramifications would be broken down by the accumulated excesses of passion.¹ Hence, in the love of travel and adventure; in the restless spirit of romance which longs for new scenes and courts new dangers;² in the unsatisfied cravings of a selfish nature,—the love of gain, whether manifested by the individual, the tribe, or the nation; in the wild and unconquerable enthusiasm of the artist, the student, or in

a number of people transferred from one country or place to another, where lands were allotted to them. The people themselves were called *Coloni*, a word corresponding to our term *colonists*. The meaning of the word was extended to signify the country or place where colonists settled, and is now generally applied to any settlement or land possessed by a sovereign state upon foreign soil.—*Cyclopedia of Political Knowledge*.

¹ It has been sensibly remarked by one of our ablest modern writers on statistical affairs, says Lord Selkirk (in his work on the colonial policy of Great Britain, published in 1816), that whoever has thoroughly investigated the commercial and colonial system, cannot have failed to notice how the different branches of human activity are gradually and successively developed, each at its proper period. To illustrate this point, this writer adds (Gentz's State of Europe before and after the French Revolution), that when agriculture and manufactures have arrived at a certain degree of perfection, the desire of foreign commerce is naturally awakened; that, although the object of this propensity may be retarded or accelerated by adverse or favorable circumstances, the persevering activity of mankind will sooner or later accomplish it;—that it will at length gain access to distant or unexplored regions, and succeed in its unremitted endeavors

to connect all parts of the earth; that the produce of remote countries becomes a new spur to industry; and that industry so excited explores and cultivates those lands, so that the productions of new regions operate to increase the activity and to multiply the commercial relations of the old; that this gives new life even to the interior of more civilized countries, and multiplies the objects of traffic; that industry produces riches, and riches reproduce industry; and thus commerce at length becomes the foundation and the cement of of the whole social edifice.

² Those who have once tasted the pleasure of roving at large through woods and over mountains can never afterwards feel happy under the restraints of society. Curiosity and the love of action, no less than their wants, must have continually urged the earliest inhabitants of the globe to explore all the varieties of its surface. Pastoral tribes feel an interest in learning the nature of the country in the vicinity of their encampments, the extent of its pastures, and the rivers which flow through and refresh it. * * * When men in the progress of their migrations reach the sea-coast, the love of gain, as well as of adventure, soon impels them to launch upon the waves, and direct their course to distant countries.—*History of Maritime and Inland Discovery*, by Dr. Jardner.

the indomitable zeal of the fanatic,—is to be found a perpetual source of new agents, and a continued evidence of God's unbounded love.

Men as colonists are influenced by different motives. In this is to be seen the interesting fact, that the diversity of things is adapted to a corresponding diversity of faculties.

The learned Sismondi, in making a comparison between the ancient and modern colonies, laments the humiliating necessity of being compelled to favor the motives and practices of the ancients, as superior to those of the moderns.

“It will be thought,” discourses this profound philosopher, “that a picture of the progressive civilization of the modern world by the colonies of Europe would not yield in grandeur to that of ancient colonization. In fact, during the three last centuries, Europeans have sent colonies into almost every part of the habitable world. They have subjugated countries infinitely surpassing in extent those they have left, and they have founded empires and republics proportionably larger than those of the Old World. Nevertheless, we cannot for a moment compare in our minds the colonies of the ancients and those of the moderns, without the first impression, even before reflection, informing us that the colonies of the ancients renewed the human race, tempered it afresh, and began political existence with all the advantages of youth; ours, on the contrary, are born old, with all the jealousies, all the troubles, all the indigence, all the vices, of old Europe; that the colonies of the ancients, in every point of civilization, constantly rose above those who had given birth to them; that ours as constantly descend below their founders: that our colonies, already so large, are destined to become larger; but that in vain will be sought for in them, the virtues, the patriotism, the vigor, which belonged to the first age of the world.

“More attentive observation makes us feel still greater differences. The Greeks, and before them the Egyptians, founded a colony that it might be complete in itself; we, that it may be a part of another empire. They had constantly in view the welfare of the colonists; we, the advantage of the mother country. They wished the colony to suffice to itself, with respect to its subsistence, defence, internal government, and all the principles of its development: we wish it to be dependent in every way, to subsist by commerce, and that this commerce should enrich the mother country; that it should be defended by her arms, obedient to her orders, governed by her lieutenants, and that these new citizens should even receive their education only from their elder brothers.

“A profound study of the colonies makes us perceive another difference, still more afflicting. The colonies of the Egyptians, of the Phœnicians, of the Greeks, and even of the Romans, brought benefits to the countries where they were established; ours, calamities. The first, by their contact,

civilized the barbarians ; the modern Europeans have, wherever they have settled, destroyed all civilization foreign to their own manners ; they have barbarized (if this expression may be allowed) the nations whom they call barbarous, by forcing them to renounce all the arts of life which they had themselves invented. They have, in their turn, barbarized themselves ; for here Europeans have descended to the manners of pastoral nations, there to that of hunters ; everywhere, in all their transactions with the aborigines, they have sullied themselves, by deceit, by abuse of force, and by cruelty ; everywhere they have gone back in the arts they brought from Europe ; their agriculture has become half savage, all their tools more rude, all their knowledge more incomplete, distinguished men more rare ; and the general level of intelligence, as well as of morality, has descended, instead of rising,"¹

No one would willingly speak lightly of the views of M. de Sismondi, and it is with feelings of deference that exceptions are made to his comparisons. His statements are loosely made, and his conclusions are at variance with the rules of reason. Acknowledged facts are misused, and the elements of common knowledge omitted. While he is bent upon pointing out the differences in result, he forgets to consider the differences in cause. Indeed, cause and effect are frequently transposed, by mistaking the conditions of success for the cause of failure. In hardly any respect are the cases which he presents parallel. It may be said, with much truth, that in almost all respects they are different. It must be remembered that every age of the world has its peculiar features, wants and means. Races stand in different relations, character demands different aids, society different processes, and nations different laws and boundaries. The empires of the ancients were as fragments compared to those of modern times. Fragment sought fragment, as in the sky the floating cloud attracts cloud before the coming rain. Separately they are comparatively nothing, but when combined a great design is accomplished. The people lived as parts of a nation, and nationality was unknown in the modern sense of the term. They had no definite conceptions of an organized government, of territorial boundaries,² of a general

¹ *Essays on Political Economy*, by M. De Sismondi, p. 249.

² "The Greeks," playfully writes Thomas Campbell, "called Homer the father of Geography. Homer is a mighty painter in song ; his tablet embraces heaven, earth and hell,—the habitations of gods and men, of the living and the dead. He is, therefore, better than a geographer ; but still, we can scarcely hail him as a patriarch of science. His chorographic fidelity is, no doubt, striking in portions of Asia, and in

the whole of proper Greece, but it relaxes very much when he gets out of the limits of Greece, and beyond the Asiatic territories of the Trojan allies. He represents Italy as an Island, he shows no acquaintance with the Caspian Sea, and he makes so gratuitous a coinage of strange countries in the *Odyssey*, that the antiquaries disputing about some of their localities remind me of a person who, when he was told that Napper Tandy had been taken, desired anxiously to be informed whereabouts

and a systematized interest, or of the rights of nations. That they entertained vague notions in respect to all these subjects, no one will deny. The position taken here is, that history furnishes no conclusive evidence that they either theorized with completeness, or practised with much reference to system.¹ A profound study of the subject should lead to opposite conclusions. The doings of nations cover vast periods of time, and he that would solve the grand phenomena of their slow but certain progress, of their destructive sway and growing power, must not mistake the means of advancement for permanent results, nor poise the pains of the moment against the blessings of eternity.

Colonization belongs to humanity. It is an outward condition of advancement. It began with the existence of man. It is a progressive process, and develops some new feature at every step. It is allied with no policy but that of principle; it stops short of no result but that which is in harmony with human progress. It precedes the action of government, and changes or outlives its original relations of dependence.

To the Egyptian and Phœnician colonists the ancient Greeks were indebted for their knowledge of agriculture, mining, commerce, and navigation. By them they were also taught the arts of weaving, writing, and coining. These colonists were influenced chiefly by motives of a commercial character. To similar motives, to their practice of banishment, and to a superabundant population, may be traced the earlier Greek colonies.²

Napper Tandy lay. He was told that the object of his inquiry was apt to shift its latitude and longitude, and was at that time probably floating at sea. The same thing may be said of countries that only floated in Homer's imagination. * * * Homer imagined the world to be encircled by the ocean, as may be seen by his description of the sculpture on Achilles' shield. The sun according to Homer, issued every morning from a beautiful eastern bay in the ocean, in a chariot drawn by four horses, and having crossed the ether, and reached the opposite oceanic stream (for it does not appear that the poet imagined it to be boundless), Apollo there bathed his horses at night, and baited for a time. It is plain that he could not have stopped the live-long night, as he had to be back in time to mount his coach in the morning; but in what manner he got back Homer has not explained. The moon, we are left to suppose, performed the same evolution. As to the constellations, Homer speaks of their bath-

ing themselves in the ocean; but he particularly excepts from this general rule of refreshment the Greater Bear, who had a surly aversion to take the water, much to the advantage of mariners, to whom Bruin served in the place of a compass."—*Metropolitan Magazine*, Vol. 1, p. 7.

¹ It was even as late as the fifteenth century A. D., that Pope Alexander VI. "appointed that a line, supposed to be drawn from pole to pole, a hundred leagues to the westward of the Azores, should serve as a limit between the Portuguese and Spaniards; and bestowed all to the east of this imaginary line upon the Portuguese, and all to the west of it upon the Spaniards. The Pope, as the vicar and representative of Jesus Christ, was supposed to have the right of dominion over the kingdoms of the earth."

² The Etruscans, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, consecrated to a particular god all the youth of a certain age, furnished them with arms, and, after the performance

The colonies of the Carthaginians in the interior as well as on the coast of Africa, Sicily and Spain, are said to have been those of conquest, and chiefly for the purpose of keeping the country in subjection. This doubtless was an important object, but if the inquiry be made what were the motives of conquest, we are again directed to those of interest, or of personal adventure or distinction. The colonial system adopted by ancient Rome was of a two-fold nature: to secure the conquered part of Italy, and to satisfy the claims of its indigent citizens by a division of lands more favorable to their plans of industry.¹

As the world progresses, the sphere of motives becomes enlarged. The faculties are more fully developed, they are exercised in new combinations, and knowledge is seen in an extended application.² In Christianity man found still higher aims and nobler duties, and was moved by an intenser zeal. The Spanish colonists in Mexico, Peru, Cuba and Paraguay; the Portuguese in Brazil and India; the French and English everywhere, may be spoken of as having been influenced by all the motives which characterized the ancients, and by the sublimer requisitions of Christianity.³

To form definite and accurate opinions of the colonies in North America, which now make a portion of the United States, it is necessary that we should turn back and study the period of their birth, the events connected

of a solemn sacrifice, dismissed them to conquer for themselves a new country.

At the end of three hundred years the Greeks were more advanced than their instructors, the Egyptians. "The community of interest," says Sismondi, "the close approximation of all the citizens, their constant action on one another, made the colonies of antiquity resemble a school of mutual instruction. What one knew all knew, all practised, all taught to the natives."

¹ The Roman Provincial system must not be confounded with their Colonial system. A Roman province, in the latter sense of that term, meant a country which was subjected to the dominion of Rome, and governed by a prætor, proprætor, or pro-consul, sent from Rome, who generally held office for a year, but sometimes for a longer period.

A distinction should be made between Roman colonies and Latin colonies. The citizens who went out to form a Roman colony retained all their civic rights. The members of Roman colonies which were

called Latin (*Coloniæ Latinæ*) had not the Roman citizenship; they voluntarily renounced part of their civic rights, in consideration of a grant of lands.—*Cyclopedia of Political Knowledge*, &c

² "It is a very ordinary subject of complaint against democratic commonwealths," says Lord Brougham, "that they always maltreat their provinces and their colonies." But, after reviewing briefly the colonial history of the republics of Greece, Rome, Carthage and of the Dutch, he concludes, "Upon the whole, it seems reasonable that there is nothing in the democratic polity peculiarly incompatible with the wise and humane management of colonial affairs," &c.—*Political History*, Vol. III, p. 185.

³ Robert Cushman, in his reasons and considerations touching the lawfulness of removing out of England into the parts of America, 1621, refers to the following passages in the Bible as authorizing and even commanding colonization,—Gen. 12: 1, 2; and 35: 1. Also, 17: 8. Matt. 2: 19. Psalm 105: 13. Josh. 5: 12. Heb. 1: 1, 2. 2 Cor. 5: 1, 2, 3.

with their growth, and mark the developments of their progress, as illustrative of great and vital principles.

ORIGIN OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

America was discovered by Columbus in 1492.¹ For more than a century it continued a wilderness, the object of an indefinite curiosity, the subject of mere speculation. It was visited occasionally by navigators, with dreamy and fluctuating motives of discovery; but its importance was measured only by the standard of the natives who ranged its hills and forests, and not by that of European civilization. It was not understood,—it was not wanted. It may have had charms for the zealot who was a lover of gold, and for the bold adventurer, who cared for no happiness but that of excitement, and for no object but that of renown. To the mass of the people in the old country, the newly discovered continent appeared more like a distant star than a territory for a civilized race,—an object of wonder, and perhaps of admiration, but altogether too remote for serious contemplation. Their wants were circumscribed by the limits of their knowledge and condition, and their grievances were remedied by expedients adapted to the narrow frame-work of the age in which they lived.

But England, France, Spain, Germany, Switzerland and Holland, were beginning to assume distinct formations in a national point of view, and mind commenced a new era by giving birth to motives which enlarged the

¹ Columbus supposed Hispaniola to be the ancient Ophir, which had been visited by the ships of King Solomon, and that Cuba and Terra Firma were but remote parts of Asia. On the 5th of March, 1495, Henry VII. of England granted a commission to John Cabot, an enterprising Venetian, who had settled in Bristol, and to his three sons, Lewis, Sebastian and Sanctius, empowering them, or either of them, to sail under the banner of England towards the east, north or west, in order to discover countries unoccupied by any Christian state, and to take possession of them in his name. In May, 1496, Cabot, with his second son, Sebastian, sailed from Bristol in a small squadron, consisting of one ship furnished by the king, and four barks fitted out by merchants of that city; and, steering almost due west, discovered the islands of Newfoundland and St. John's, and soon afterward reached the continent of North

America.—*Marshall's Amer. Col. History.*

But the student will be inclined to give some consideration to the *Ante-Columbian Discoveries*. An Icelandic historian, Torfæus, has claimed for his ancestors the glory of having discovered the New World. (*Torfæi Historia Vinlandiæ Antiquæ, Hafniæ*, 1705.) A learned work has recently been published by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, at Copenhagen, giving an account of the voyages made to America by the Scandinavian Northmen during the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The accounts of these early voyages are published from authentic manuscripts, which date back as far as the tenth century. The work is entitled, "*Antiquitates Americanae sive Scriptores Septentrionales Rerum Anti-Columbianarum in America. Hafniæ*, 1837."—See *App. R. I. Hist. Coll.*, Vol. 4.

circles of enterprise, multiplied the objects of life, and elevated the purposes of existence.¹ Nations were seen as individualities, freedom was claimed as a natural right, government as a protection, and religion the holy cause of each and all. Towards these momentous topics the universal mind became directed. Nations became the observers of nations, public practice was reduced to national law, and discovery became the subject of competition. Gain, the great incentive to commercial enterprise and success, the fruitful source of jealousy and renewed endeavor, combined to produce magnificent schemes and golden encouragements. The claims of science were asserted by the philosopher, the divine right of kings was questioned by the government, the sway of the Pope was resisted by royalty and the prerogatives of conscience were declared by the people: The moral tides of nations had begun to flow and ebb, and society to enlarge its boundaries. The political atmosphere of England at this time was filled with the spray of party strife; communities were distracted by the convulsive throes of religious passion, disloyalty, and universal mistrust.²

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries constituted a period of division, trial and experiment. Church and state were struggling together in a common cause, slowly fortifying the government against the returning tides of Papacy,³ and laboring with distracted purposes to assert a unity in the midst

¹ An extraordinary impulse was given, about this period, to the progress of European civilization, by the simultaneous invention—or, at least, introduction from the East—of the mariner's compass, gunpowder and artillery, an improved system of arithmetic, and the art of printing. Combined with these were a renewed study of the Roman law, the cultivation of Greek literature, the restoration of the fine arts, and the opening of new paths of industry and commercial enterprise.—*Taylor's Natural History of Society*.

² The early part of the seventeenth century was denominated "an age of vipers, and monsters of all sorts."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. II, p. 660 (1640). In the House of Lords, 1641, Bishop Hall speaks with great feeling of "the woful and lamentable condition of the poor Church of England, your dear mother." "My lords," he continues, "this was not wont to be her style. We have heretofore talked of the famous and flourishing Church of England, but now your lordships must give me leave to say that the poor Church of England humbly

prostrates herself at your lordships' feet (next after his sacred majesty), and humbly craves your compassion and present aid. My lords, it is a foul and dangerous insolence this, which is now complained of to you; but it is only one of a hundred of those which have been of late done to this church and government. The Church of England, as your lordships cannot choose but know, hath been and is miserably infested with papists on one side, and schismatics on the other. * * * Alas! my lords, I beseech you consider what it is that there should be in London and the suburbs and liberties no fewer than fourscore congregations of several sectaries, as I have been too credibly informed, instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, taylor, felt-makers, and such like trash, which all are taught to spit in the face of their mother, the Church of England, and to defy and revile her government."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. II, p. 989.

³ In 1620 Sir Jerome Horsey moved, in the House of Commons, "that four or six of that House might be appointed to search

of influences which were springing from the desperate contests between public authority and individual opinion,—between the rights of conscience and the claims of government. They stood side by side, each supporting the other, but both in fearful apprehension of separate positions.

The public mind became engaged in determining the boundary-lines of humanity. Toleration was either exalted as a virtue, or stigmatized as a crime.¹ The compatibility of two governments appeared as clear as that of two systems of religion. Opinions were scrutinized as conclusive evidence of innocence or of malignity, and nonconformity reduced to action was war upon the state. The subject of rights was severed from the fortified securities of the past, and became a topic for private and public discussion. What reason did not accomplish was left to be snatched by the competing hands of bigotry, and what was not protected by justice became the mangled prey of corrupted factions. Each faction had its separate interests, theories, instruments, and ends; and what could not be gained by concession was claimed by virtue of fanatic pre-eminence. Property was viewed as the rightful source of strength to the strongest, weakness the evidence of wrong, and resistance to oppression as a fearful heresy, or a dangerous rebellion. The people became the victims, successively, of an oppressive government, of religious frenzy, of insurrection, and of anarchy. They

the vaults and cellars under the Parliament-house, twice a week. He feared another Gunpowder Plot. Sir James Perrot moved (1620) "that all the members of the House might take the communion, which was the touchstone of their faith."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. I, p. 1184.

¹ In the sixteenth century the Inquisition, and its kindred spirits everywhere, had concentrated the gaze of the world upon the single subject of toleration,—the freedom of opinion. Enormities were committed which made humanity shudder, and mind began to question the soundness of a theory which could not be reduced to practice without an aggregation of cruelties "which robbed horror itself of its sway over the soul." John Louis Vives, a Spaniard of great learning and reputation, bewails the fate of moderate and charitable Catholics in Spain. In a letter to Erasmus, dated May 18th, 1534, he says: "We live in hard times, in which we can neither speak nor be silent without danger." In the forty-three years of the administrations of the first four Inquisitors-general, which

closed in the year 1524, they committed eighteen thousand human beings to the flames, and inflicted inferior punishments on two hundred thousand persons more, with various degrees of severity. "Some of these occurrences in Spain," Sir James Mackintosh very properly remarks, "and the numerous executions in the Netherlands, must have been well known in England about the period of the death of Mary, and could not fail to affect the state of opinion in that island, so much that a writer of English history cannot with justice exclude all mention of them in his narrative; especially when the memorable circumstances are considered, which we learn from the weighty testimony of the Prince of Orange, that the Spanish and French monarchs meditated the extension over all Christendom of such a tribunal as the Inquisition had already shown itself to be, by its exercises of authority in Spain."

The return of exiles from the seats of Calvinism in Switzerland, at the moment of Queen Elizabeth's accession to the throne, and the accumulated results of

were either cramped by monopolies,¹ or stretched by levellers.² Either above the throne, or beneath its ruins. Alternately the subjects of paralyzing fears and elevating hopes, they followed their varying leaders to the clubs or private assemblies, participated in the secret plots, or rushed to join the gathering mob.

The fruits of industry, instead of yielding comforts and protection to the laborer, sharpened the rapacity of the tax-gatherer, and aggravated the grievances of oppression. Traders became bankrupts; mechanics, beggars. Mothers, wives and daughters, left the quiet but comfortless sphere of home, to join in tumultuous processions, bearing prayers to Parliament for relief from starvation.³ Young men and boys, deprived of thriving masters,

great teachers (Wickliffe, Huss, and Calvin) of the fifteenth century, combined to produce the events just noticed of the sixteenth, and in this period the people were still further prepared for the revolutions which occurred in the seventeenth.

¹ In 1601 a most interesting debate took place in the House of Commons on a bill against monopolies. One member said that a monopolist might well be termed the whirlpool of the prince's profit. Another member (the mover of the bill) said that it presented "no new invention," but was in accordance with the legislation of "their forefathers more than three hundred years before." Sir Robert Wroth said: "There have been divers patents granted since the last Parliament; these are now in being, namely, the patents for currants, iron, powder, cards, ox-shinbones, train-oil, transportation of leather, lists of cloth, ashes, aniseed, vinegar, sea-coals, steel, aquavitæ, brushes, pots, salt-petre, lead, accidences, oil, calaminstone, oil of blubber, fumachoes, or dried piltchers in the smoak, and divers others." Upon reciting of the patents, Mr. Hackwell stood up and asked, "Is not bread there?" "Bread," quoth one. "Bread!" quoth another. "This voice seems strange," quoth another: "this voice seems strange," quoth a third. "No," quoth Mr. Hackwell, "but if order be not taken for these, bread will be there before the next Parliament."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. I, p. 923. The evils of monopoly were sadly multiplied in England, and the subject has always been a prominent one in Parliament.

² The Levellers insisted on an equal distribution of power and property, and disclaimed all dependence and subordination.

³ On February 4th, 1641, Sergeant-major Skippon applied to the House to know what was to be done with a crowd of women who had appeared at the doors with a petition to the Commons for the redress of grievances; they telling him "That where there was one now there would be five hundred the next day; and that it was as good for them to die here as at home." Butler alludes most probably to this circumstance in the following couplet:

"The Oyster-women locked their fish up,
And trudged away to cry 'No Bishop.'
Hudibras, Part I, canto 2.

"The House advised him to speech them fair," so says the record, "and send them home again: but this day they were as good as their words; they came down in great numbers, and presented a petition to the Commons, which was received and read." It is stated that "the petition was presented by Mrs. Anne Stagg, a gentlewoman, and brewer's wife, and many others with her of like rank and quality." Mr. Pym was appointed to reply to the "good women;" which he did with becoming courtesy, promising that members of Parliament would exert their utmost power to protect them, their husbands, and their children, and closed his short address by entreating them to return home, and there to give Parliament the benefit of their prayers. In 1643 several thousand women appeared at the

left their work-shops unenlivened by the din of labor, to find relief in the excitements of riot, rapine and destruction. What nature failed to present in shapes of forbidding reality, disordered imagination supplied in hideous phantoms of superstition. The spirit of witchcraft still lurked in the dark recesses of the human soul, and the voices of unholy tongues floated on the midnight air, and the cramps and twinges of invisible hands were felt in the weak and trembling nerves of the distempered.¹ The government itself was thrown from its centre by contending parties, each controlling, in its turn, the business of a people, the interests of a nation. The rule of Britain was in process of change. The king, wanting in justice, ceased to be acknowledged as the legitimate sovereign, and like the humblest of his subjects, was made responsible for his misdeeds and errors.² The Parliament as master or slave, was moulded into every variety of form, and placed in every variety of position. Free to control, or fettered by humiliating restraints; banished by the usurpations of royalty, or paralyzed by disunion,—the Parliaments of this period were the great engines of experiment. Exponents of public opinion, they became the theatres of its fluctuating violence, illustrating the great principle that the possession of power is permanent only where there is purity of motive, conformity in practice.

At this time the religious principle constituted the life-blood of the government. The fear of God was seen everywhere in theory, however wanting

Parliament-house with a petition demanding peace. Sir John Hippisley, and two or three other members, were appointed to return for answer "That the House were no enemies to peace, and that they did not doubt, in a short time, to answer the ends of their petition; and desired them to return to their habitations." This answer proved unsatisfactory, and they were not prevailed upon to leave until the troops were called to force them. The troops at first, in firing, used nothing but *powder*; but they were ridiculed by the women, who threw brickbats at them. Bullets were then fired, and several women killed; when the crowd slowly dispersed, crying out louder and louder, as they retired, "Give us those traitors that are against peace, that we may tear them to pieces! Give us that dog Pym!" etc. Pym was out of favor.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. II, p. 1073; Vol. III, pp. 160, 234, 235.

¹ "Demonology was a favorite topic with King James. He demonstrated, with erudition, the reality of witchcraft; through

his solicitation it was made, by statute, a capital offence. He could tell 'why the devil doth work more with ancient women than with others;' and hardly a year of his reign went by but some helpless crone perished on the gallows, to satisfy the vanity and confirm the dialectics of the royal author."—*Bancroft's Hist. U. S.*, Vol. I, p. 293.

² At the time of the overthrow of Charles the First, the feeling of the people was that of intense hate against a king and monarchy. The Commons ordered a new seal to be engraved, on which that assembly was represented, with this legend, "On the first year of freedom, by God's blessing restored, 1648." The forms of all public business were changed from the king's name to that of the keepers of the liberties of England. The Commons intended, it is said, to bind the Princess Elizabeth apprentice to a button-maker; the Duke of Gloucester was to be taught some other mechanical employment. The king's statue in the Exchange was thrown down, and on the

in practice.¹ Clothed with authority, and combined with every variety of mental development, condition and interest, this enduring element added zeal to purpose, energy to action, and persistence to will. Every party was known by its ecclesiastical standard. Conformity was required by all, but conceded by none. Great questions had been reached. New political problems were to be solved. Truths were to be defined, and doubts dissipated. Could freedom of opinion be tolerated, and the state preserved? Was conscience a principle of divine origin, or an opinion subject to human laws? Did not the possession of power imply the relation of responsibility for its uses; and why should the great and increasing evils of heresy be permitted to sadden the righteous, or to weaken their hands in the holy cause with which they had been intrusted? What was the church? What was the state? Was the state a part of the church, or the church a part of the state? Or, were they independent of each other? These questions, and such as these, unnumbered in name and nature, were asked and answered, both by government and by the people. They had been known only as the questions of learned men and reformers. They were now the topics of a nation. Religious liberty was defined by government,—it was claimed by the people. Civil liberty was defined by the church,—it was claimed as the prerogative of Parliament. Privilege was defined by the Lords,—it was claimed by the Commons. The people by degrees had begun to think for themselves,—to realize the dignity of the human mind, the principle of human rights.

On these momentous questions parties were formed. As the power of the government was the greatest seemingly within the reach of man, all sought to control its mighty agency,—each to advance an impulse, a theory, an interest, or all of these. Religious freedom was deemed incompatible with civil liberty. Government would not yield to the citizen, because its power exempted it from the necessity; and the citizen refused submission to government, except so far as it represented faithfully the objects of its creation. Each had become the keeper of the other.

These inquiries had agitated the public mind, more or less, since the mid-

pedestal these words were inscribed, "Exit tyrannus, regum ultimus." The tyrant is gone, the last of the kings. It was sarcastically pretended that some of the republicans, in reciting the Lord's prayer, would not say "Thy kingdom come," but always, "Thy commonwealth come."—*Hume*, Vol. v, p. 383.

¹ During the commonwealth of Cromwell, Parliament voted that they had no occasion for a chaplain. They sometimes voted to spend a whole day in "SEEKING THE LORD" in prayer. Their method was, that as soon

as about a dozen members were met, they began with prayer, and so continued praying, one after another, till there was a sufficient number assembled to make up a House, and then the speaker took the chair.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. III, p. 1410.

In the time of Charles the First, when the Puritanical party had become strong, two clergymen of that sect, Marshall and Burgess, were chosen to preach before Parliament, and they entertained the members with discourses seven hours in length! So it is said by *Hume*, Vol. v, p. 142.

dle of the fourteenth century. Progress had been slow, but certain : results had been small, but glorious. What had been looked upon as too insignificant for formal recognition, had become comparatively speaking, in the seventeenth century, a powerful party.

THE PURITANS IN ENGLAND.

From the rights of the citizen the PURITAN¹ proceeded to examine the rights of government. He doubted all authority but divine revelation, and questioned all laws but those of Christ and the prophets. The Bible was his statute-book and constitution, his text book of science and economics. It was received by all Christians as the book of God, and the Puritan received it in its entirety with reverence and sincerity. He asked for no other guide, he favored no other view, he acknowledged no other authority. He saw sacrilege in comparison, and eternal danger in doubt and hesitation. He sought to understand the destiny of man, by studying him as the child of God. He found duty portrayed in the requisitions of his Maker, and discovered a source of rewards greater than could be commanded by human governments.² He believed that all men were looked upon with equal favor

¹ The name PURITAN was applied to the non-conformists of England in the third century after Christ. It was a term of reproach derived from the Cathari, or Puritans. It was used says Gov. Bradford, "to cast contempt the more upon the sincere servants of God." A writer quoted by Prince says, "They are called PURITANS who would have the church thoroughly reformed; that is, purged from all those inventions which have been brought into it since the age of the apostles, and reduced entirely to the scripture *purity*." The *Plymouth* colonists were called PILGRIMS, a name given them by Hutchinson. Although this name is much used, and is associated with extreme and opposite opinions, still, with motives to convenience, the early colonists will generally be designated in the present work as PURITANS.

Lathbury says,—“It should be observed that the term Puritan was applied indiscriminately to all who entertained scruples relative to conformity. It was applied to three distinct parties; to the moderate Puritans, who never left the Church, to the present Presbyterians and to the Brownists.” *Hist. English Episcopacy*, p. 54.

It is not the purpose of this work to

discuss the merits or demerits of any religious denomination whatever. Religion is an eternal element in the Providence of God. Democracy was taught and practised before the Christian era, and since that period its great truths have been nobly defended, both by the Catholic and Protestant,—each in his own way. Both Christians and infidels have admitted the general fact, that the Puritans were democrats, and as such they find their place in history. In *Froude's* “address on Calvinism,” he says,—

“The Persians caught rapidly Zoroaster's spirit. Uncorrupted by luxury, they responded eagerly to a voice which they recognized as speaking truth to them. They have been called the Puritans of the Old World. Never any people, it is said, hated idolatry as they hated it, and for the simple reason that they hated lies.” p. 80.

² In his lectures on Modern History, Professor Smyth gives advice to his auditors, which all Americans will readily approve. His language is: “You should learn to understand the character of the Puritan as soon as possible; you must never lose sight of it, while reading this particular portion of history” (the time of Queen Elizabeth). As the professor could not give

by the Creator, as the subjects of salvation; and that all laws not in conformity with this principle of impartial love were unauthorized and unjust. He saw in the countenance of the peasant the divine image stamped with lines of beauty, as strongly and deeply as in that of the king; and in the

in his course of lectures the details of history in a sufficient degree to convey a proper idea of the times, he selects a specimen in the character of Peter Wentworth, a Puritan, and member of Parliament, and gives the substance of a speech which he delivered, and of his examination before a committee of Parliament. He continues: "Wentworth was one of the most intrepid and able asserters of the privileges of the House, and being a Puritan, he was irresistibly hurried forward, not only by a regard for the liberties of the subject, but by religious zeal. Here, therefore, in Wentworth, we have immediately presented to us a forerunner of the Hampdens and Pym, and, in Elizabeth, of Charles, the great actors that are to appear in the ensuing scenes:

"Elizabeth, after stopping and controlling the debates and jurisdiction of the House on different occasions, at last commissioned the speaker to declare, in consequence of a bill relating to rites and ceremonies in the church having been read three times, that it was the queen's pleasure 'that, from henceforth, no bills concerning religion should be preferred or received into this House, unless the same should be first considered and approved by the clergy.' This was in 1575.

"Wentworth, and, indeed, other members, had on former occasions not been wanting to the duty which they owed their country; but this interference of the queen produced from him, some time afterwards, a speech which has not been overlooked by Hume, and is in every respect memorable. Far from acquiescing in the ideas which Elizabeth had formed of the prerogative of the prince, and of the duties and privileges of the Parliament, expressions like the following are to be found in his harangue. You will observe the mixture of religious and patriotic feelings: 'We are assembled to make, or abrogate, such laws as may be

to the chiefest surety, safe-keeping, and enrichment of this noble realm of England.

. I do think it expedient to open the commodities [advantages] that grow to the prince and whole state by free speech used in this place.' This he proceeded to do on seven different grounds; and he concluded, 'That in this House, which is termed a place of free speech, there is nothing so necessary for the preservation of the prince and state as free speech, and without this, it is a scorn and mockery to call it a Parliament-house; for in truth, it is none, but a very school of flattery and dissimulation, and so a fit place to serve the devil and his angels in, and not to glorify God and benefit the commonwealth.' And again;—'So that to avoid everlasting death, and condemnation with the high and mighty God, we ought to proceed in every cause according to the matter, and not according to the prince's mind. The king ought not to be under man, but under God and under the law, because the law maketh him a king; let the king, therefore, attribute that to the law which the law attributeth unto him,—that is, dominion and power; for he is not a king in whom will and not the law doth rule, and therefore he ought to be under the law.' And again:—'We received a message, that we should not deal in any matters of religion, but first to receive from the bishops. Surely this was a doleful message; for it was as much as to say, 'Sirs, ye shall not deal in God's causes; no, ye shall in no wise seek to advance his glory.' We are incorporated into this place to serve God and all England, and not to be time-servers, as humor-feeders, as cancers that would pierce the bone, or as flatterers that would fain beguile all the world, and so worthy to be condemned both of God and man. . . . God grant that we may sharply and boldly reprove God's enemies, our princes and state; and so shall every

sweet smile of the humble orphan a soul as precious as any to be found within the palace gates. In every human form he recognized a brother, in every kindred spirit a fellow-laborer. He saw in man a being created for eternity, a candidate for redemption, and alike the agent of power and the subject of just obedience.

one of us discharge our duties in this our high office wherein he hath placed us, and show ourselves haters of evil and cleavers to that that is good, to the setting forth of God's glory and honor, and to the preservation of our noble queen and commonwealth.'

The speech is not short, and he goes on to conclude thus:—"Thus I have holden you long with my rude speech; the which since it tendeth wholly, with pure conscience, to seek the advancement of God's glory, our honorable sovereign's safety, and to the sure defence of this noble isle of England, and all by maintaining of the liberties of this honorable council, the fountain from whence all these do spring, my humble and hearty suit unto you all is, to accept my good-will, and that this, that I have here spoken out of conscience and great zeal unto my prince and state, may not be buried in the pit of oblivion, and so no good come thereof.'"

The examination before the committee of Parliament is here given entire, as printed in the Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, p. 793. Although of considerable length for a note, no considerate reader will desire to see it abridged.

"*Committee.* Where is your late speech you promised to deliver in writing? *Wentworth.* Here it is, and I deliver it upon two conditions: the first is, that you shall peruse it all, and if you can find any want of good-will to my prince and state in any part thereof, let me answer all as if I had uttered all. The second is, that you shall deliver it unto the queen's majesty; if her majesty, or you of her privy council, can find any want of love to her majesty or the state therein also, let me answer it. *Committee.* We will deal with no more than you uttered in the House. *Wentworth.* Your honors cannot refuse to deliver it to her majesty; for I do send it to her majesty

as my heart and mind, knowing it will do her majesty good; it will hurt no man but myself. *Committee.* Seeing your desire is to have us deliver it to her majesty, we will deliver it. *Wentworth.* I humbly require your honors so to do. Then the speech being read they said,—*Committee.* Here you have uttered certain rumors of the queen's majesty; where and of whom heard you them? *Wentworth.* If your honors ask me as counsellors to her majesty, you shall pardon me; I will make you no answer; I will do no such injury to the place from whence I came; for I am now no private person,—I am a public, and a counsellor to the whole state, in that place where it is lawful for me to speak my mind freely, and not for you, as counsellors, to call me to account for anything that I do speak in the House; and therefore, if you ask me as counsellors to her majesty, you shall pardon me, I will make no answer; but if you ask me as committees from the House, I will make you the best answer I can. *Committee.* We ask you as committees from the House. *Wentworth.* I will then answer you; and the willinger for that mine answer will be in some part so imperfect as of necessity it must be. Your question consisteth of these two points, Where and of whom I heard these rumors? The place where I heard them was the Parliament-house; but of whom, I assure you I cannot tell. *Committee.* This is no answer, to say you cannot tell of whom; neither will we take it for say. *Wentworth.* Truly your honors must needs take it for an answer, when I can make you no better. *Committee.* Belike you have heard some speeches, in the town, of her majesty's misliking of religion and succession; you are loth to utter of whom, and did use speeches thereupon. *Wentworth.* I assure your honors I can show you that speech, at my own house, written with my hand two or three

Their motives were both religious and political. When the state became a party in defence of the church, the sectaries combined against the state. The friends of religious reform became politicians, and statesmen ecclesias-

years ago. So that you may thereby judge that I did not speak it of anything that I heard since I came to town. *Committee.* You have answered that, but where heard you it, then? *Wentworth.* If your honors do think I speak for excuse-sake, let this satisfy you; I protest before the living God I cannot tell of whom I heard these rumors; yet I do verily think that I heard them of a hundred or two in the House. *Committee.* Then of so many you can name some. *Wentworth.* No, surely, because it was so general a speech, I marked none; neither do men mark speakers commonly when they be general; and I assure you, if I could tell, I would not. For I will never utter anything told me, to the hurt of any man, when I am not enforced thereunto, as in this case I may choose. Yet I would deal plainly with you, for I would tell your honors so; and if your honors do not credit me, I will voluntarily take an oath, if you offer me a book, that I cannot tell of whom I heard those rumors. But, if you offer me an oath of your authorities, I will refuse it; because I will do nothing to infringe the liberties of the House. But what need I to use these speeches? I will give you an instance, whereupon I heard these rumors to your satisfying, even such a one as, if you will speak the truth, you shall confess that you heard the same as well as I. *Committee.* In so doing we will be satisfied. What is that? *Wentworth.* The last Parliament [by which it may be conceived he meant and intended that Parl. in An. 13 Reg. Eliz.] he that is now speaker [namely, Robert Bell, Esq., who was also speaker in the first session of this present Parl. in An. 14 Reg. ejusdem] uttered a very good speech for the calling in of certain licenses granted to four courtiers, to the utter undoing of six or eight thousand of the queen's subjects. This speech was so disliked of some of the council, that he was sent for; and so hardly dealt with, that he came into

the House with such an amazed countenance, that it daunted all the House in such sort, that for ten, twelve, or sixteen days, there was not one in the House that durst deal in any matter of importance. And in those simple matters that they dealt in, they spent more words and time in their preamble, requiring that they might not be mistaken, than they did in the matter they spake unto. This inconvenience grew unto the House by the council's hard handling of the said good member, whereupon this rumor grew in the house. 'Sirs, you may not speak against licenses: the queen's majesty will be angry,—the privy-council, too, will be angry, and this rumor I suppose there is not one of you here but heard it as well as I. I beseech your honors discharge your consciences herein as I do. *Committee.* We heard it, we confess, and you have satisfied us in this; but how say you to the hard interpretation you made of the message that was sent into the House? [the words were recited.] 'We assure you we never heard a harder interpretation of a message.' *Wentworth.* I beseech your honors, first, was there not such a message sent unto the House? *Committee.* We grant that there was. *Wentworth.* Then I trust you will bear me record that I made it not; and I answer you that so hard a message could not have too hard an interpretation made by the wisest man in England. For, can there by any possible means be sent a harder message to a council gathered together to serve God than to say, 'You shall not seek to advance the glory of God'? I am of this opinion, that there cannot be a more wicked message than it was. *Committee.* You may not speak against messages, for none sendeth them but the queen's majesty. *Wentworth.* If the message be against the glory of God, against the prince's safety, or against the liberty of this Parliament-house whereby the state is maintained, I neither may nor will hold my peace. I cannot in so doing

tics. All were full of zeal, confidence and activity. Self-reliance was a prevailing feature of the age. All were doubted, but no one doubted himself. The expansion of the religious principle burst the boundaries of the

discharge my conscience, whosoever doth send it. And I say that I heartily repent me for that I have hitherto held my peace in these causes, and I do promise you all, if God forsake me not, that I will never during life hold my tongue, if any message is sent wherein God is dishonored, the prince perilled, or the liberties of the Parliament impeached; and every one of you here present ought to repent you of these faults, and to amend them. *Committee.* It is no new precedent to have the prince to send messages. [Then were two or three messages recited, sent by two or three princes.]

Wentworth. Sirs, said I, you do very evil to allege precedents in this order. You ought to allege good precedents to comfort and embolden men in good doing, and evil precedents to discourage and terrify men to do evil. *Committee.* But what meant you to make so hard interpretation of messages?

Wentworth. Surely I marvel what you mean by asking this question. Have I not said so hard a message could not have too hard an interpretation; and have I not set down the reason that moved me in my speech, that is to say, that for the receiving and accepting that message God has poured so great indignation upon us, that he put into the queen's heart to refuse good and wholesome laws for her own preservation; which caused many loving and faithful hearts, for grief, to burst out with sorrowful tears; and moved all Papists, traitors to God, to her majesty, and to every good Christian government, in their sleeves to laugh the whole Parliament-house to scorn. Have I not thus said? and do not your honors think it did so? *Committee.* Yes, truly. But how durst you say that the queen had unkindly abused herself against the nobility and people? *Wentworth.* I beseech your honors, tell me how far you can stretch these words of her unkindly abusing and opposing herself against her majesty's nobility and people. Can you apply them any further than I have applied them; that is to

say, in that her majesty called the Parliament of purpose to prevent traitorous perils to her person, and for no other cause; and in that her majesty did send unto us two bills willing us to take our choice of that we liked best for her majesty's safety, and thereof to make a law promising her royal consent thereunto; and did we not first choose the one, and her majesty refused it? Yet did not we, nevertheless, receive the other? And, agreeing to make a law thereof, did not her majesty in the end refuse all our travels? And did not the lord-keeper, in her majesty's presence, in the beginning of the Parliament, show this to be the occasion that we were called together? And did not her majesty in the end of the Parliament refuse all our travels? Is not this known to all here present, and to all the Parliament-house also? I beseech your honors discharge your consciences herein, and utter your knowledge simply as I do; for in truth herein her majesty did abuse her nobility and subjects, and did oppose herself against them by the way of advice. *Committee.* Surely we cannot deny it; you say the truth. *Wentworth.* Then I beseech your honors show me if it were not a dangerous doing to her majesty in these two respects:—First, in weakening, wounding and discouraging the hearts of her majesty's loving and faithful subjects, thereby to make them the less able or the more fearful and unwilling to serve her majesty another time. On the other side, was it not a raising up and encouraging the hearts of her majesty's hateful enemies to adventure any desperate enterprise to her majesty's peril and danger? *Committee.* We cannot deny but that it was very dangerous to her majesty in those respects. *Wentworth.* Then why do your honors ask how I dare tell a truth, to give the queen warning to avoid her danger? I answer you thus, I do thank the Lord my God, that I never found fear in myself to give the queen's majesty warning to avoid

civil power. It was like the flood that overflows the banks, and spreads beyond the prescribed limits of past experience. Government was not prepared for the shock, and was lifted up and carried forward to new foundations. The creative power of mind, the cheering hopes of the soul, the fierce and impulsive propensities of man's common nature, were all centred in the service of the religious sentiment. Society was overwhelmed with new views, feelings, and aspirations. Government lost its force and authority, industry its reward, and home its securities. Families became insensible to the ties of kindred blood; the golden bands of friendship tarnished and crumbled; the silken cords of love untwined and fell asunder; and all seemed entranced in gazing upon a heavenly vision which opened the Book of Life, and displayed the glad tidings of another world, an eternal home for the repentant sinner. The interests of earth faded into insignificant shadows before the melting blaze of truth presented by the hand of Almighty Power. Society looked out from its convulsive bosom to seek a freedom in

her danger; be you all afraid thereof, if you will, for I praise God I am not, and I hope never to live to see that day; and yet I will assure your honors that twenty times and more, when I walked in my grounds, revolving this speech to prepare against this day, my own fearful conceit did say unto me that this speech would carry me to the place whither I shall now go, and fear would have moved me to have put it out; then I weighed whether in good conscience, and the duty of a faithful subject, I might keep myself out of prison, and not to warn my prince from walking in a dangerous course; my conscience said unto me that I could not be a faithful subject, if I did more respect to avoid my own danger than my prince's danger. Herewithal I was made bold, and went forward as your honors heard; yet when I uttered those words in the House, that there was none without fault,—no, not our noble queen,—I paused and beheld all your countenances, and saw plainly that those words did amaze you all; then I was afraid with you for company, and fear bade me to put out those words that followed; for your countenances did assure me that not one of you would stay me of my journey; yet the consideration of a good conscience, and of a faithful subject, did make me bold to utter it in such sort as your honors heard; with this heart and

mind I spake it, and I praise God for it; and if it were to do again, I would with the same mind speak it again. *Committee.* Yea, but you might have uttered it in better terms; why did you not so? *Wentworth.* Would you have me to have done as you of her majesty's privy-council do, to utter a weighty matter in such terms as she should not have understood? To have made a fault, then, it would have done her majesty no good; and my intent was to do her good. *Committee.* You have answered us. *Wentworth.* Then I praise God for it; and, as I made a courtesy, Mr. Seckford spake these words: *Committee.* Mr. Wentworth will never acknowledge himself to make a fault, nor say that he is sorry for anything that he doth speak; you shall hear none of these things come out of his mouth. *Wentworth.* Mr Seckford, I will never confess that to be a fault, to love the queen's majesty, while I live; neither will I be sorry for giving her majesty warning, to avoid danger, while the breath is in my body. If you do think it a fault to love her majesty, or to be sorry that her majesty should have warning to avoid her danger, say so; for I cannot. Speak for yourself, Mr. Seckford.

“Mr. Wentworth was committed to the Tower.”

harmony with its spiritual necessities. The spirit of religion became too mighty for the narrow limits of civil liberty in England. Democracy, combining religious zeal with patriotism, self-respect with the spirit of sacrifice, led the Puritans to seek a home in the wilderness, and to establish a church among the heathen.

In their view, civil liberty was of no account without religious principle, and, based on religious principle, a government became an institution of God for the advancement of humanity. In England they saw a people divided and disheartened by the accumulated wrongs of the past, and in America a new land of promise.

Thus, in the midst of a distracted people and changing government, was erected by the PURITANS the standard of DEMOCRACY. They fearlessly asserted its glorious truths, and claimed for man that civil position in society for which he was so marvellously fitted by his Maker, and the exercise of all those privileges promised him in the Holy Bible. Here was the great issue between the democratic and conservative parties of England, in the seventeenth century.

"There were," says M. Guizot, "two national wants in England at this period: on one side was the need of religious revolution and liberty in the heart of the reformation already commenced, and on the other was required political liberty in the heart of pure monarchy, then in progress; and in the course of their progress these two wants were able to invoke all that had already been done in either direction. They combined. The party who wished to pursue religious reformation invoked political liberty to the assistance of its faith, and conscience against the king and bishops. The friends of political liberty again sought the aid of popular reformation. The two parties united to struggle against absolute power in the temporal and in the spiritual orders, a power now concentrated in the hands of the king."

In the brief space given to the consideration of the origin and gradual formation of the democratic party in England, which resulted in peopling the American continent, and led to the revolutions which elevated Cromwell, and which caused the downfall of James II., it will be quite impossible to do but little more than classify events in a general way.

The quotation from Guizot properly refers to a period of more than a century. National events can be studied with profit only in the extended relations of national existence. The revolution of Cromwell was the result of a combination of numerous religious sects, the growth of several generations, and for a time united by the oppressive acts of a tyrant king. The next movement had more of a political character, and a closing period is to be found in the revolution of 1688. It was the succeeding wave of progress, in England, to that of 1643.

The PURITANS embarked in the Mayflower, as the representatives of Democracy. They knew its history in England; their fathers had bequeathed

to them its responsibilities.¹ They had fought its battles, formed just conceptions of the blessings which it was calculated to yield and foster, and beheld with clear convictions the dangers to be pointed out and avoided, and the new safeguards to be secured and established.

THE PURITANS IN AMERICA

The political survey of the colonies here proposed is a general one, and extends from the settlement of the Pilgrims, at Plymouth, 1620, to the time of the Revolution and Declaration of Independence, 1776. During this period of one hundred and fifty-six years, thirteen colonies had arisen. Each colony had its own peculiar origin, growth and character, and is to be considered as a distinct political element. The object of the present general view is to become, in some degree, acquainted with those fundamental principles which guided our fathers in founding the American nation. Such a method of inquiry appears necessary to a clear understanding of the great outlines of the general subject. In the discussion of topics contemplated in this work, of course, a frequent return to the events of the colonies for illustration will be necessary; and whatever is omitted in the general survey will appear in its appropriate connection, in chapters devoted to the consideration of national measures.

Much has been said and written in respect to the motives which constituted the moral strength of the Puritans.² What enabled them to withstand the cruel treatment of a jealous government, and to survive the bitter persecu-

¹ It is even admitted by Hume, who could approve of no government but that of a monarchy, that "so absolute, indeed, was the authority of the crown (in the time of Elizabeth), that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution."

"It is to the democratic puritans," says De Lolme, "that the regeneration of British freedom may in some measure be ascribed,—but their actions were not influenced by the pure spirit of national independence, as in truth, like all political 'patriots,' they only 'bellowed for liberty to-day, that they might roar for power to-morrow.'"

"Puritanism indeed," says South, "is

only reformed Jesuitism, as Jesuitism is nothing else but Popish Puritanism: and I would draw out such an exact parallel between them, both as to principles and practices, that it would quickly appear they are as truly brothers as ever were Romulus and Remus; and that they sucked their principles from the same wolf."—*De Lolme on the British Constitution*, p. 318.

² "Let us not stultify ourselves," says Hon. Joel Parker, "by the superlative folly of regarding the Puritans as a band of narrow-minded sectaries, animated by no broad nor generous motives, who aimed to establish an exclusive community, from which every one of broader sympathy and more tolerant spirit should be rigorously shut out." Exclusion of the promoters of contention is not the exclusion of persons of the broadest sympathy and the widest toleration. "Let us have a correct under-

tions, which subjected them to almost every species of humiliation and suffering?

The details of events through which they voluntarily passed, the scenes of mental agony and physical prostration which marked their gloomy way; their extraordinary foresight and courage, their inward content, and their outward prudence and watchfulness, cannot be considered without intense interest, nor without lasting profit.¹ Their simple story has been the theme of the ablest minds; their deeds and relations, their opinions and institutions, make up the pages of unnumbered volumes; and yet, we still pause and reflect in wonder, in view of how little has been said, and how much remains to be studied and truly understood.

The Puritans were men. They were actuated by human motives. They understood the objects of life; they saw and realized the necessities of existence. They appreciated comforts, but not at the expense of duty. They honored the spirit of loyalty, but not at the expense of principle. Government was looked upon by them as a means of security, not of restraint. They saw in God a King above royalty, and in the Bible an authority above that of Parliament. They desired to live a godly life, but as citizens of a just government.

standing of what the Puritans were in their day, which will lead us to very different conclusions.

"They were non-conformists. It was their non-conformity, religious and civil, which brought them hither, to establish the principles of their non-conformity, in a colony to be based on the very foundations of their non-conformity."—*Lecture*, p. 84.

¹ In obedience to the queen, in 1593, a law was passed entitled An Act to keep Her Majesty's Subjects in Obedience. At this time the Puritans had greatly increased, and the sufferings which followed in the wake of the execution of this act were frightful. The prisons were filled, many families were banished, and some were put to death. It was declared by Sir Walter Raleigh, in Parliament, that there were not less than twenty thousand Puritans, divided into several congregations, in Norfolk and Essex and in the vicinity of London alone. Among the Puritan ministers were Smith, Jacob and Airsworth, the last, one of the most learned men of the age. Smith was confined in prison a year before he was even

heard, and members of his church "were shut up in close rooms, not being allowed the liberty of the prison." "Here," says Neal, "they died like rotten sheep; some of the disease of the prison, some for want, and others of infectious disorders." "These bloody men" (the High Commissioners), according to Barrow, in his supplication, "will neither allow us meat, drink, fire, lodging, nor suffer any whose heart the Lord would stir up for our relief to have any access to us; by which means seventeen or eighteen have perished in the noisome jails, within these six years. Some of us had not one penny when we were sent to prison, nor anything to procure a maintenance for ourselves and families but our handy labors and our trades; by which means not only we, but our families and children, are undone and starved." "That which we crave for us all is the liberty to die openly in the land of our nativity. If we deserve death, let us not be closely murdered,—yea, starved to death, with hunger and cold, and stifled in loathsome dungeons."—See *Neal's History of the Puritans*.

They had not been indifferent observers of the glowing descriptions of navigators who had visited the continent;¹ and it would be a libel upon their memory to suppose that they were insensible to the material qualities and charms of the New World, as connected with their personal tastes, wants, hopes, and propensities. They were distracted by no plans of socialism, nor were they troubled with any agrarian theory, or transcendental speculations. They were religious men, endowed with an extraordinary degree of common sense. They loved truth, without despising gain. The love of gain is an instinct of nature. It is a fundamental faculty. It characterizes every society. It is a part of man's condition,—an element of the world's progress. The Puritans had it,—all have it. It cannot be disguised,—it should not be disowned. It is a noble instrument, though a despicable end. It is a convenient servant, but a degrading master.

LOVE OF NATIVE LAND.

The Puritans left behind a country that was still dear to them for the many comforts and delights in which they had been permitted to participate, and they could not divest themselves of the natural pride which had made a part of their existence from the cradle, as connected with the events of their country's joys, their country's glory.

The soil of their native land had been consecrated by the gladsome sports of childhood, the privileges of youth, and by noble contests of successful manhood. There is an instinct implanted in the human heart which seems to hallow the atmosphere of infancy, and renders sacred the early scenes of existence. The first objects of sight, hearing and touch, become interwoven with the joyous and crowding thoughts of the young mind, and the associations then formed constitute the spirituality of national feeling.

"Mother country" is no unmeaning phrase. It indicates a relation without which no citizen could be known, no nation could endure. It indicates a sentiment which lights up the eye of patriotism, nerves the strong arm of the warrior, fills the heart of the philanthropist, and distinguishes the man of public spirit from the grovelling creature of a sordid mind. A being insensible to its generous enthusiasm, or indifferent to its noble control, is looked upon by society with horror and indescribable contempt.

To suppose that the Puritans were destitute, in any degree, of this inborn

¹ Columbus himself, in one of his letters to Ferdinand and Isabella, describes the Americans and their country thus: "This country excels all others, as far as the day surpasses the night in splendor. The natives love their neighbor as themselves; their conversation is the sweetest imagina-

ble; their faces always smiling; and so gentle, so affectionate, are they, that I swear to your highnesses there is not a better people in the world." At the present day such a statement requires no comment. —*Smith's Description of New England.*

sentiment, is to allow an exception to a general law of human nature. To suppose even that they were indifferent to its influence, is to do them a gross injustice, by appearing to forget their frequent and ardent declarations to the contrary. Their love of home was as sincere as their sense of duty was powerful. They could neither conceal the one nor withstand the other. They were made up as men of extraordinary parts, deficient in none. They desired to stand upright before God; and they preferred freedom in the wilds of America to oppression in England, though they looked back upon their native land with tears and lamentations, as their great exemplar before them had turned weeping towards Jerusalem.

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE PURITANS.

The Puritans now stand in new relations,—the inhabitants of the western hemisphere. They are still regarded in the light of subjects of Great Britain, though invested with new and transatlantic powers, and separated from the immediate control of old ones, by an assumed act of royalty. Their condition was one of stern realities. Wishes and common wants were swept away by dire necessities, and their recollections of the past were shut out by constant and fearful apprehensions for the future. They stood alone. If the king granted them charters and patents, he promised them no army or fleet for protection; and if they had his prayers and blessings, it was not because they were of any value, but because they cost him nothing. Royalty had condescended to exercise a doubtful power, by giving them permission humbly to endeavor to take care of themselves, in the forests of a heathen land,—doubtless gratified more by a faint hope that a new source of revenue had been opened to the nation, by a class of troublesome subjects, than by any motive of service entertained either for their profit or for their happiness.¹

¹ "It has often been observed by me," says John Adams, "and it cannot be too often repeated, that *colonization is casus omissus* at common law. There is no such title known in that law. By common law, I mean that system of customs, written and unwritten, which was known and in force in England in the time of King Richard the First. This continued to be the case down to the reign of Elizabeth and King James I. In all that time, the laws of England were confined to the realm, and within the four seas. There was no provision made in this law for governing colonies beyond the Atlantic, or beyond the four seas, by authority

of Parliament; no, nor for the king to grant charters to subjects to settle in foreign countries. It was the king's prerogative to prohibit the emigration of any of his subjects, by issuing his writ *ne exeat regno*; and, therefore, it was in the king's power to permit his subjects to leave the kingdom. *

"So that our ancestors, when they emigrated, having obtained permission of the king to come here, and being never commanded to return into the realm, had a clear right to have erected in this wilderness a British constitution, or a perfect democracy, or any other form of government they saw fit. They, indeed, while they lived,

With a view distinctly to trace and understand the causes that have made the colonies what they are, it is necessary that we should have a clear idea of their moral and political beginning. By what authority did the Puritans land on the shores of the American continent? What rights did they claim, and what were their principles? Did they look to Great Britain for a government, or were they self-inspired to make their own laws, and to control their own destiny? or, were they to be the subjects of two governments, —one of their own, and another imposed upon them by the king and Parliament? These and similar questions crowd upon the reflecting mind, when turned to contemplate the desolate landing of the PILGRIM FATHERS upon the Plymouth rock.

The Puritans seemed to be solemnly impressed with the great responsibility of their position, both in respect to themselves and posterity. They were here as Christian citizens, in a state of nature, free to make a beginning according to their own convictions of duty. It was an opportunity¹ not to be neglected, compromised, or postponed. The representatives of Democracy on board of the Mayflower, before landing, united upon the following COMPACT:

"In the name of God, amen! We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign lord, King James, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, France and Ireland, king, defender of the faith, &c., having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in northern parts of Virginia² do, by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation; and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute and frame, such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

"In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names, at Cape

could not have taken arms against the King of England without violating their allegiance; but their children would not have been born within the king's allegiance, would not have been natural subjects, and consequently not entitled to protection, or bound to the king."—*Life and Writings of John Adams, by Charles F. Adams*, vol. iv., p. 121. *Novanglus*, No. viii.

¹ "Man's extremities are God's opportunities," was a saying quoted in Parlia-

ment more than two hundred years ago.

² "The Pilgrims, by coming so far north, had got beyond the limits of the Virginia Company, and accordingly their patent was of no value. On the return of the Mayflower, in May, 1621, the Merchant Adventurers applied in their behalf to the president and council of New England for a grant of the territory on which they had unintentionally settled. This, it seems, was readily accorded."—*Young's Chronicles of the Pilgrims*, p. 114.

Cod, the 11th of November, in the year of the reign of our sovereign lord, King James of England, France and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini 1620.”¹

This compact has been the subject of extravagant comment, both of appreciation and of disparagement. Some writers have discovered much and extraordinary wisdom in it, while others have been unwilling to admit that it was entitled to particular notice. It is quite possible that most men would agree in respect to the measure of its importance, if they were to view it in the same relations as to the past and future. The Puritans had left a land remarkable for its published laws, declarations, protests, and proclamations; where government inhered in hereditary distinctions, and where human rights and immunities were defined and engrossed with great formality on parchment. The simplicity of common sense was a rare quality in the Lords and Bishops, and no one will claim that it was a distinguishing feature of the Commons. The public documents of England were characterized more by a tedious verbosity than an acceptable perspicuity; and there had been an apparent ambition on the part of the framers of the laws to excel rather in habits of mysterious expression, than in that plain choice of words which appears to have a distinct object, and proceeds with directness to state it. It is to be regretted that American legislation is encumbered with similar evils, most of which may be traced to English sources. In view, therefore, of what the Puritans had been accustomed

¹ The following are the names subscribed to the compact, namely:

Mr. John Carver † 8	*John Turner 8
William Bradford † 2	Francis Eaton † 8
Mr. Edward Winslow † 5	*James Chilton † 8
Mr. William Brewster † 6	*John Crackston 2
Mr. Isaac Allerton † 6	John Billington † 4
Capt. Miles Standish † 2	*Moses Fletcher 1
John Alden 1	*John Goodman 1
Mr. Samuel Fuller 2	*Degory Priest 1
*Mr. Christopher Martin †	*Thomas Williams 1
*Mr. William Mullens † 5	Gilbert Winslow 1
*Mr. William White † 5	*Edmund Margeson 1
Mr. Richard Warren 1	Peter Brown 1
John Howland	*Richard Britterige 1
Mr. Stephen Hopkins † 8	George Soule
*Edward Tilly † 4	*Richard Clarke 1
*John Tilly † 3	Richard Gardner 1
Francis Cook 2	*John Allerton 1
*Thomas Rodgers 2	*Thomas English 1
*Thomas Tinker † 3	Edward Dotey
*John Ridgdale † 2	Edward Leicester
*Edward Fuller † 3	In number, 100.

[The number in each family is denoted by the figures; those marked with an asterisk (*) died before the end of March; those with an obelisk (†) brought their wives with them.]

always to see at home, in all important public matters ;—in view of what was still more important to themselves in their future relations,—it must be confessed that the compact cannot be considered other than an extraordinary document. It may be termed, with great truth, a conservative beginning, comprehending a progressive democracy. It marked with boldness the circle of freedom, and recognized the great principles of justice and equality. It turned back upon the past with all due expressions of loyalty, without any concessions of right, and placed the general good of the people on the broad foundations of a simple outline, which could be seen by all, and misunderstood by none. That they should have been the authors of an act so important, and upon the meaning of which, for a period of more than two hundred years, there has been no division, is a fact worthy of serious remark, if not to be justified as a sufficient cause of wonder.¹

INSTRUCTION, NOT SELF-AGGRANDIZEMENT, THE OBJECT OF POLITICAL HISTORY.

In studying the institutions of a country with a desire to understand the various causes, whether latent or open, real or apparent, that have conspired to build them up ; in all endeavors to trace and define the motives of their founders, our studies frequently lead to emotions of wonder, when the discovery is made that an extraordinary degree of human wisdom is proved, beyond all question, in their works. What was projected in outline and executed with success, is ascribed to clearness of judgment in the application of principles. A succession of measures, sustaining a progressive principle, is looked upon as a specimen of consummate wisdom. An accident, or an undesigned event, which ends in beneficial results, is clearly a smile from Heaven,—a providential dispensation. These habits of remark are not mentioned for the purpose of making exceptions to those acts of the mind which favor motives, and claim for the past all the glory which in truth and candor belongs to it. In no respect would we exert an influence to lessen the exercise of a just and wholesome veneration for the

¹ In speaking of this compact, John Quincy Adams says : " This is perhaps the only instance in human history of that positive original social compact which speculative philosophers have imagined as the only legitimate source of government. Here was a unanimous and personal assent, by all the individuals of the community, to the association by which they became a nation. It was the result of circumstances and discussions which had occurred during their passage from Europe, and is a full

demonstration that the nature of civil government, abstracted from the political institutions of their native country, had been an object of their serious meditation. The settlers of all the European colonies had contented themselves with the powers conferred upon them by their respective charters, without looking beyond the seal of the royal parchment for the measure of their rights and the rule of their duties."—*Oration, delivered Dec. 22, 1802.*

labors and achievements of those pioneers of principle who accomplish much, but who seldom live to see the maturity of their plans, or to realize the objects of their wishes. Such a purpose would be as unnatural as it would prove to be indefensible. Justly to appreciate the motives of those who are no longer present to speak for themselves, is a sacred duty. Still, while the principle of duty is acknowledged, it becomes the humble inquirer to approach the subject rather as one of instruction than of self-aggrandizement,—rather as the source of evidence of a divine control, than of the truth of those propositions of philosophy which, in view of the ordinary events of life as ordered by Deity, give precedence to accident, or mistake the infinite for the finite. Our subject is one of principles, not of men; of ideas, not of things.¹ In men and things illustrations are to be found which may tend to sustain a theory, or to expose a fallacy. But in all investigations which have for their aim the development of truth, as leading to a better and a higher practice, that error of confounding original causes with human motives should be carefully avoided. It must be remembered that democracy is no new system of modern times.

DEMOCRACY IS NO NEW SYSTEM OF MODERN TIMES.

Democracy has been asserted and defended in all ages. In ages of mental darkness it has been as the distant light to the feeble vision of the ignorant,—a goal to be reached, but not yet practically realized.² Its broad dimensions and unfathomable depths were defined with as much clearness by the ancient prophets as they are by the wisest of to-day. The attributes of Deity have encircled a universe from eternity with their inextinguishable light; and all people have reverently acknowledged their power, though but few have been able to gaze upon so brilliant a glory,³ or practically to combine their sublime aspects with the affairs of humanity.

The designs of men, who are the slaves of debasing appetites and unholy motives of ambitious control, may sometimes bear a semblance of success; but their power is like the cable of sand to stay the ship, or the bursting

¹ "Ideas once generated live forever," says a distinguished writer.

² "It is absurd to *expect*, but it is not absurd to *pursue*, perfection," is a remark of Sir James Mackintosh.

³ "There is only one cure," says Macaulay, "for the evils which newly-acquired freedom produces, and that cure is *freedom*. When a prisoner leaves his cell, he cannot bear the light of day; he is unable to discriminate colors, or recognize faces;—but the remedy is not to remand him to his

dungeon, but to accustom him to the rays of the sun. The blaze of truth and liberty may at first dazzle and bewilder nations which have become half blind in the house of bondage; but let them gaze on, and they will soon be able to bear it. In a few years men learn to reason; the extreme violence of opinion subsides; hostile theories correct each other; the scattered elements of truth cease to conflict, and begin to coalesce; at length a system of justice and order is educed out of the chaos."

bubble to hide the sun, when placed within the influence of the attributes of Infinite Wisdom.

By slow degrees only has man been able to note the scale of so high a standard. His conceptions of the possible gradually become the incentives to new endeavors, and what seemed beyond the reach of human capacity becomes in process of time a visible reality in practice. It is thus that the outward world is made to conform to the loftiest requisitions of the inward mind, and that the end of being is made manifest by the great events of Providence.

With high conceptions of the infinite, and with zealous convictions of a practical Democracy in regard to the finite, the Puritans took possession of the American continent; not having the power to realize, even in the remotest degree of distinctness, the magnitude of the great work of which they were but the humble beginning. In making choice of the Western continent for a home, they acted in conformity to the instincts and sentiments of their nature, guided by an enlightened judgment. They erected the Democratic standard¹ without a single abatement of its lofty streamers, and commenced a contest for the greatest liberty.

A CONTEST FOR THE GREATEST LIBERTY.

This was natural. It is always so with people who attempt to enlarge their national freedom. The great idea of liberty, when left to act upon the popular mind, opens to the beholder a new world in its entirety, where motive apprehends no sin, where jealousy has withered no passion. All are filled with a hope to do right; none are conscious of a weakness that will lead to the commission of wrong. It is an opportunity seized upon with all the avidity which moves the soul let loose from arbitrary confinement, and inspires it to enjoy the utmost freedom, and to concede it.

But, while it leaves the pure in heart to rejoice for a time in new privileges, it affords the corrupt and selfish a license to indulge in the commission of new crimes. It was so with ancient empires, where the people rushed forward to sustain the leaders of revolution, where all was promised and but little realized. It has been so in all the revolutions of France; and in no country, perhaps, has the great principle of freedom been more beautifully and truthfully analyzed than by the gifted minds of that powerful nation. It has been so in Germany, where popular will is smothered by the cowardly alliances of impotent sovereigns, and where constitutions are flat-

¹ Judge Halibarton says: "They were all at home."—*Rule and Misrule of the English in America*, p. 87.
and state they had so cheerfully abandoned

tered into embryo, and strangled at their birth. It was so in the vast dominions of the great Czar, where the unfortunate Pestel and Ryleieff,¹ and their confederates, became inspired by the democratic teachings of the Bible, and formed their secret liberty clubs throughout the empire, resolved to subvert the government, and establish one of equal rights.

In reference to this principle of unreserved occupancy, it is often remarked that, if revolutionists would attempt less, they would accomplish more. This has often been said of France. But how the exertion of a lesser power is to surpass that of a greater, is far from being explained in the terms of such a proposition. In all rebellions there is a declaration of right, and a public discussion of principles. The gain from such movements is one of knowledge; and, as an element of progress, is of far greater consequence than the slight concessions of arbitrary power.

This disposition of the human mind to extend its control to the entire limits of its own conceptions is one of incalculable importance. It fills with human effort the entire circle of moral duty; and new truths are early discovered, that they may be prepared to meet the wants of coming periods.

In the settlement of the American continent, the colonists were placed in new relations, which they began immediately to define, and to surround with their best means of defence. With just motives in regard to safety, they claimed all without resort to violence they had the power to protect, and they required all they had the power to enforce. They came out as a party to enjoy the blessings of Democracy, but soon became a commonwealth subject to party divisions. They had exchanged the humble position of individual responsibility for that of public control; and what had been claimed for themselves as a right in England soon became dangerous to grant to others as a privilege in America. With the accumulated results of experience, and with their views of public duty, the Puritans possessed all those stern elements of character requisite for the settlement of a new country. They were as well established in their determination what to avoid, as they were firm in executing the plans chosen and approved by their judgment. They were democratic republicans in principle, and they were resolved to be truly so in practice. But the great subject involved in

¹ Ryleieff was a poet, and a great admirer of Washington, and of the institutions of the United States. He undertook to complete the *Catechism of the Free Man*, commenced by N. Mouravieff; and he wrote both prose and verse in favor of freedom. Seditious songs of his composing were circulated among the people. At the time of execution, three of the five conspirators

fell to the ground, the rope being badly adjusted. Although stunned, at first, by the fall, Ryleieff walked with a firm step, but could not help uttering this painful exclamation,—“Must it be said that nothing succeeds with me, not even death!” According to some witnesses, he also exclaimed, “Accursed country, where they know neither how to plot, to judge, nor to hang.”

a profitable consideration of the colonies is that of the conditions of national existence.

THE CONDITIONS OF NATIONAL EXISTENCE.

What are the elements of national power, of national greatness? In what do they consist, and on what do they depend?

The American colonists of the seventeenth century, and many of their successors of the eighteenth, have long been tenants of the tomb, sleepers in the dust. Their bodily presence has crumbled with the humble slabs which mark their graves; but their children's children, their country and their country's institutions, have become the hope of humanity, the glory of the world.

In their stead millions tread the continent. The Indian, whose sway was the dread of the Puritans, and whose range was co-extensive with the continent, now knows no country, counts no tribe, forms no nation. His race has ceased to make a part of humanity, except in subserviency to civilization. His hunting-grounds have been shorn of their wildness, and the eye of the surveyor has scaled the mountain heights, and fathomed all the streams. Their water-falls have been harnessed by the hand of industry to subserve the interests of man, and their broad lakes and rivers bear upon their bosom the freighted wealth of nations. The forests have fallen before the woodman's axe; and where beasts were tenants, the mighty powers of civilization preside. Where the trail of the native marked the secluded soil of the wilderness, the terrific engine of the railroad moves with resistless force and impetuous speed, translating the hill to the valley, the mountain to the ocean, and the population of the country from city to city, giving to all frequent opportunities to witness the unnumbered scenes of industry, beauty and munificence, which everywhere mark the land. Where humble settlements struggled to find the means of existence, states have risen out-rivalling ancient empires, and the vast continent, which was then visited by the few of almost every nation, has become the territory of a people whose government rests upon the illimitable basis of that Democracy recognized by the Puritans, and whose institutions have become the wonder of the civilized world, and the dread of despotism.

Who does not join, with a sense of unconquerable amazement, in the inquiries,—Whence these mighty results? Where are the sources of such boundless streams of causation? In what form can men behold the principles which have given birth to such examples of benevolence and grandeur, to such harmonious designs of duty and noble activity?

It is not to the possession of wealth that we are to look, for this was death to the greatness of Spain. The colonists were poor. It is not to be ascribed to the principle of monarchy; for, with all her kings and queens,

and illustrious statesmen, Great Britain has yet to discover the true causes of popular discontent, the sources of public prosperity. The colonists were republicans. It is not to the acquisitions of philosophy in the lands of a Kant or of a Cuvier that the mind is to be directed for a solution of such questions, for their countries have been the scenes of frequent revolution, and still remain as significant examples of how little human misery is lessened by human learning. The colonists were working men.¹ Nor can an answer be found in the mighty army of Russia, where martial law is government; nor in the Celestial Empire, where ignorance is safety, and activity treason. These nations are still bound by the strong chains of despotism, sustained by a multitudinous soldiery; and vast masses of human beings linger in hopeless indifference to the highest emotions of the soul, and passively submit to suffering as the birthright of freemen. The colonists were their own protectors, their own teachers.

Where, then, shall the common mind be directed for instruction on this exalted theme? Where find the primary influences that prepare the mind for that lofty exercise of the virtues which dignify and adorn individual character, and enlarge the motives that hold sacred the rights of a citizen, and with extended arms of power encompass and protect, with equal certainty, the great interests of a nation? Where, but to the eternal source of truth and justice? Where wisdom adapts itself to the constitution of things, heeding the lessons of the past, relying upon knowledge, protecting the present by a government of laws, and, jealous of rights, providing for the future by the institutions of education and religion? Where motives are characterized by divine attributes of love and integrity, and truth is illustrated by examples of the self-sacrificing spirit of devotion to duty, clothed with a power that knows no glory but in the happiness of its subjects? Influenced by such motives and principles, the Puritans began their work.

THEIR HABITS OF APPLICATION AND PRUDENCE WERE EARLY ESTABLISHED.

They knew no pride but in duty, no ambition but in sacrifice. Their hopes had long been chastened by the strong arm of an oppressive government, and their anticipations were circumscribed by an experience that indulged in no extravagant promises. Wants were limited to the narrow

¹ "As for this poor Relation, I pray you thing, it is their ignorance, that are better to accept it as being writ by the several acquainted with planting than writing."—actors themselves, after their plain and *Robert Cushman's Letter from Plymouth,* rude manner. Therefore doubt nothing of in 1621.
the truth thereof. If it be defective in any-

compass of stern necessities, and pleasures restrained within the sober bounds of duty.¹ The idea of luxury was banished from the mind, as incompatible with its necessities, and habits of idleness and of frivolity were looked upon with a horror next to that of death to the body, or dissolution to the state.² They promptly rejected all speculative propositions, and discountenanced all doubtful experiments. They looked upon loss of any kind with fearful apprehensions. Their possessions were small, their numbers few, their visible power insignificant. Time and mind were their only capital, opportunity their only privilege.³ A constant activity, a perpetual vigilance, a self-reliance that centred in God, a firmness that yielded to nothing but death, were the undeviating and only conditions upon which they could be saved and continued. In their boldness they were cautious; in their prudence, courageous. With what indomitable pertinacity they adhered to their plans and executed their purposes, may be seen in the numerous events recorded by the historian.⁴

FORMATION OF CHARACTER AIDED BY EXTERNAL OBJECTS.

But in the estimate of human character, it is not to be forgotten that man is constantly surrounded, influenced and controlled, by agencies which inhere in the constitution of things. Man stands not alone. He may be the "tenth, or ten-thousandth" link in the great chain of the moral universe. He seems to will as he likes, but he cannot always act as he wills. He is prone to believe himself the primary agent of power, when he is but the humble subject of submission. Law pervades all the faculties of his being, all the circumstances of life. These are controlled by laws, and according to laws they are governed and exercised. Placed in relation to external objects, man is everywhere favored or opposed by the phenomena of existence. He breathes an atmosphere adapted to his bodily wants. He

¹ Josselyn, who visited New England in 1638, says: "July 10, I went ashore upon Noddle's Island, to Mr. Samuel Maverick, the only hospitable man in all the country, giving entertainment to all comers gratis." In 1635, the General Court manifested its high displeasure at his extravagance. — *Young's Chronicles of Massachusetts*, p. 322.

² "There is a generation which think to have more in this world than Adam's felicity in innocency, being born, as they think, to take their pleasures and their ease. Let the roof of the house drop through, they stir not; let the field be overgrown with weeds,

they care not; they must not foul their hand nor wet their foot. It's enough for them to say, Go you, — not, Let us go, — though never so much need. Such idle drones are intolerable in a settled commonwealth, much more in a commonwealth which is but as it were in the bud." — *Robert Cushman's Discourse to the Colonists*, 1621.

³ Want of punctuality was made a penal offence.

⁴ Read "HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM THE DISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CONTINENT," by George Bancroft. This writer discusses national topics with ability and eloquence.

treads the earth subject to all its laws. He thinks and acts in harmony with his spiritual being; and whether the agent or subject of power,—the observer of objects or the object observed,—the man, the citizen, the ruler, or the ruled,—he finds himself but an humble part of the mighty whole, the active or the passive element of society. From the cradle to the grave, he passes through all the social and national relations of good and evil, power and want. He is both a contributor and a receiver of benefits. He is alike the subject of favor and of adversity, of pleasure and of pain. He succeeds or he fails, in the execution of his plans, according to the measure of his wisdom or the folly of his habits; and his life is one of ease or of hardships, according to the age in which he lives, or the principles by which he is governed. In whatever position he stands, the great work of Providence is advanced with irresistible force, to the accomplishment of the designs of divine beneficence. Oppression, adversity, hardships and suffering, with their appalling train of unwelcome events, are transformed by the hand of Deity into sources of moral strength and spiritual endurance.

In all these relations of trial the Puritans were placed. They were tested and proved in relation to the simple elements of things. They commenced with the first principles of social and national growth, and guarded the sources of influence in their earliest risings. The comparatively sterile and rock-bound soil of New England, and the severity of the climate, rendered labor a necessity; and thus were established permanent habits of industry. With no conventional aid to sustain them, they sought out the resources of individual existence, and found an aid in every circumstance, an ally in every object. They had faith in God and nature, and by God and nature they were sustained, exalted, and advanced.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

The chief element of national existence is sovereignty. It is political independence, an efficient state of self-direction in a government. It is comprised in the condition of ability,—an ability that is equal to the control of internal and external governmental emergencies. It comprehends the man, the citizen, the nation, and all their relations of duty and alliances of power. It is the embodiment of conventional power in its greatest efficiency; and, while it is alive to all the conditions by which it is preserved, it yields nothing to the spirit that seeks to abridge its prerogatives. The compact of individuals may recognize the principle, but the reality is a result of the slow process of successful endeavor and defence.

In sovereignty, properly understood, are to be found all the great principles which inhere in the spirit of liberty. Its degrees range from the individual to the nation from the smallest conventional forms of organization to

that of government itself in its mightiest functions. The completeness of the whole depends upon the completeness of its parts.

The colonists did much to develop this great principle. It was practically conceded to them by the crown. The Charter granted to Massachusetts, dated March 4, 1628, stipulates to "the Governor and Company, and their successors,—that it shall and may be lawful to and for the chief commanders, governors and officers of the said Company for the time being who shall be residents in the said part of New England in America by these presents granted, and others there inhabiting, by their appointment and direction, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, for their special defence and safety; to encounter, expulse, repel and resist, by force of arms and by all fitting ways and means whatsoever, all such person or persons, as shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprise the destruction, detriment, or annoyance to the said plantation or inhabitants, and to take and surprise by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons with their ships, armor, munition, and other goods, as shall in hostile manner invade, or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said Company and inhabitants." ¹

Let the principle be carefully studied, in its various conditions of advancement. Still, with this idea of sovereignty in regard to the American settlements, the colonists acknowledged the King of Great Britain as their lawful sovereign. The admission however; was merely technical. It was not even theoretical. Many of the colonists had long been democratic republicans. They were so still. It must be remembered that republicanism is not always democracy, although it would be difficult to find an example of democracy that was opposed to republicanism. The one relates to form, the other to principle. This view does not involve the necessity of doubting their loyalty, because they had not yet discovered that the feeling of sovereignty, which they had realized, was inconsistent with their allegiance as subjects of a monarchy. They had not yet been entirely persuaded of the practicability of a republic; and, while religious liberty was to them a subject of paramount importance, they were not disposed to test the question of form, where they had promised themselves the enjoyment to be realized in the practice of principle.

Sovereignty that is based upon the exercise of absolute power is consolidation. Though consolidation strictly refers to the uniting of parts which have already existed, still the term may be used, perhaps, as significant of absolutism. It has but a single reliance. It is self relying upon self. If it fails in self, it has no alternative but to fall. It is the will of a single mind reduced to the narrow scale of individual wisdom.

Sovereignty that is based upon Democracy is subordinate to fundamental principles. Every form of power is a warrant of security. Great interests

¹Lecture by Joel Parker, p. 11.

have their own safeguards, and what protects one protects all. It commences with the individual. It is self-knowledge, self-control. It extends to the family and to the social circle. In them it is the entire fulfilment of duty in the private relations of life. With a regulating hand it advances with the common interests of society, and towns¹ and cities, as such, become each its own master and protector. That is, in the settlement of certain interests, they exercise a supreme authority, admitting of no appeal. Still enlarging its circles of control to meet the wants and emergencies of society, towns and cities are formed into states, and states into empires. Treaties are negotiated, alliances are formed, and national law defined and promulgated, and thus the civilized world is subdivided by man, in view of his wants, interests, and necessities. These classifications are not arbitrary,—they inhere in nature. They are the legitimate results of natural causes, and exist in harmony with the natural laws. What self-respect is to the individual, and duty to private life, sovereignty is to the town, to the state, to the empire. It is a primary law of moral and political existence, and is to conventional power what identity is to person. It is found to be limited or extended, according to the capacities of the individual or the people. In relation to progress, it is either complete or incomplete; that is, nominal or real. Language is inadequate for definition. And in this connection the great distinction should be observed which exists between religious and political independence. The sovereignty of the religious world centres in God, and is perfect. Political sovereignty is conventional, and centres in man; and is more or less complete, according to the degree of his perfection. It is a sovereignty of progress, a sovereignty that recognizes the necessity of improvement, but which surrenders no prerogative of principle.

It forms a most beautiful as well as instructive subject, to see with what completeness the elements of national existence combined to aid the Puritans.

¹ "We may, however, be sure of one point," says Lord Brougham. "Democracy is much more natural to towns or cities than to country districts; and here it may be observed that in general popular governments, either on the aristocratic or democratic model, have at all periods of the world been more usually established in the towns than in the country."

De Tocqueville says:—"Local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Town-meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within the people's reach, they teach men how to use and how to enjoy it." These admissions are in harmony with a

well-established fact, that the people are democratic in the same degree that they are justly informed. To say that "local assemblies" and "town-meetings" constitute the strength of a nation, is to assert in other words, that the people themselves are the source of national strength, which is true. These frequent neighborhood meetings give opportunities for mutual instruction, and hence their great importance.

The town government was derived from the authority of Scripture. In the "*Abstract of Laws and Government*," proposed by John Cotton, in 1655, the following passages are quoted: Deut. 16: 18; Exod. 18: 21, 22; Jer. 36: 10—12.

All nations and nature opened sources of life, interest and strength to the New England colonies.

The power of the Indians insured union to the white man, and their divisions gave allies. Territory was as free to the pilgrim as air to the outcast. This is a primary condition to independence. Without territory, equitably divided among men in the commencement of a community, independence is impossible. It is the foundation of interest, as interest becomes the leading element in the foundation of power. It gives to every man, town, state and nation, a boundary-line to protect, a class of interests to promote. Genius becomes graduated to the sphere of its incentives, and industry confines its labors to the limits of human motives. All become workers with distinct objects in view, and each class of men accomplish not only a private end, but a common good.

Here was to be seen what has proved to be of incalculable value to the American Union,—the great principle of state sovereignty, ordinarily denominated State Rights.¹ The party lines in respect to this subject were early and deeply drawn. The perpetual topics of discussion, to be found in all nations, in reference to land titles and boundary-lines, were prominent ones in the colonies. The contest was confined to no company, to no section. All became alike involved. The influence of interest was combined with that of national pride, and what was wanting in reason was more than supplied by prejudice. National rivalries and antipathies, with all the bitterness of accumulated hate, had their sway in the business of defining the charters and patents of the king, and in adjusting conflicting titles,—difficulties which designing men had contrived, or ignorance had permitted. What a spectacle to behold! Insignificant and yet distinct bands of citizen adventurers, just arrived and scattered in a wilderness, and already engaged in earnest controversies concerning territorial rights! Every civilized nation had its representative in some active position. It is true the different colonists were not here to act by authority of the government of their respective nations. They were invested with a superior power. The uncompromising spirit of nationality, incorporated, as it were, in the passions of the individual, was everywhere alive, native responding to native, and each appealing to the government of his home for protection. In all these conflicts, the natives of England, Scotland, France, Sweden and Holland, were more or less concerned, and entered into combinations characterized by local interest and national peculiarities, as various as the lights and shades of the setting sun depicted upon the rocks and dells of the mountain-side.

No colony was exempt from these territorial difficulties, and it is to be

¹ In this connection allusion can only be subject. It will be more fully considered made to the elements of this important in another place.

hoped that no state is to be found where the results of these early contests are not permanently preserved in an immovable attachment of the people to the democratic doctrine of state sovereignty. State sovereignty is to the nation what the breakwater is to the city upon the sea-side. It is defence against accumulated force indefinitely exercised. Its prerogatives consist in the absolute control of its own rights as a state, in the exercise of its own power as a sovereignty. When viewed in their relations to the government, the difference between a freeman and slave is not greater than that existing between a sovereign state and a subordinate department of a consolidated confederacy. Without a bill of rights, there can be no sure freedom of person; without state sovereignty, protected by a constitution, there can be no security to a republic. An indispensable condition to sovereignty is to be found in the exercise of equal rights.

THE EXERCISE OF EQUAL RIGHTS.

No one will contend that equal rights can spring from unequal beginnings, or unequal conditions. In old countries the difficulty of such a beginning, or condition, must be obvious to all. It is, indeed, an inadmissible supposition. It is an event impossible. It is beyond the reach of law, without involving the dangers of revolution; and it is beyond the reach of revolution, without ending in anarchy. The unequal results of imperfect laws and institutions,—the diversified conditions of men as traceable to the varied capacities of mind,—are not to be levelled by the hand of government, nor harmonized by the inefficient theoretical influences of social communities.¹

Practical industry thrives best where competition is most active, and success is most certain where individual enterprise is most encouraged. If every man acts for himself, provided his standard of duty is in harmony with the good of others, he is adding character to society, and wealth to the state.

EQUALITY IS BEST COMMENCED IN POVERTY.

In this relation, poverty is an indispensable condition to equal rights. It

¹ France is in a condition of unequal development. In some respects the nation is in advance of all others; but it must be admitted that in other important particulars it is comparatively deficient. The family and the town organizations are wanting. While Paris is France, France must be cramped by Paris. The popular will, like an unguarded ocean ingulfs the boundaries of right. The tides of impulse and ignorance still defy the limits of judgment. The *Socialists* have their great errors, but their extravagance may command attention where prudence would not be heard. They are working to supply an evident want, but they ask too much. With an honest intent to supply a part that is wanting, they commit the serious error of proposing to do it at the expense of the whole, already established. Great evils require special and extraordinary remedies. Even when much is asked, but little is gained.

is to capacity what territory is to persons. It is an open field for endeavor, equally free to all, though all are not endowed with equal ability to cultivate it. Every man according to his talents. Poverty has the powerful and inventive aid of necessity. It hinders no motive but that of extravagance; it favors no act but that of economy. It has no promises of greatness for ambition, no golden bribe for corruption. To pride and jealousy it offers no fuel for the flame of passion, and envy is disarmed by the meekness of its bearing.

But the reader must not confound the poverty of possession with the poverty of sentiment. A man may stand forth in the true dignity of his nature, honoring God, helping man, comprehending and enjoying the true luxuries of life, the happiness of virtue, the independence of integrity, the delights of religion, and be unable to command the wealth sought by commerce, or which misers grasp with a death-like selfishness. He is poor in possession, but rich in the best gifts of humanity. On the other hand, a man may look upon material wealth as the great object of existence. His ambition may be graduated to the grovelling scale of gain, without regard to principle, control or good. He may be as rich as a Rothschild, or an Astor, or a Stewart, but in spirit poorer than the meanest beggar that sues for charity in the streets of the metropolis. The biography of such a person may be comprised within the meaning of two insignificant words: *here* and *there*. He was born, he died. He and all his possessions were *here*, they are now *there*. He acquired property, but did not use it. He existed, but did not live.

In a miser's view the Puritans were poor. As nature's noblemen, none could boast of greater riches.¹ They sought for aid in industry, character, and religion. With these, success was certain; without these, impossible.² Their chief aim, when embarking for America, seemed to be comfortably to

¹ Gov. William Bradford, it is said, was the richest man in Plymouth Colony, when he died. The amount of his property was about nine hundred pounds. He died in 1659. The next in rank for wealth was Miles Standish, who died in 1656. His property was estimated at about four hundred pounds. Wages at this time, it must be considered, were very low; and as there was but little money in the colonies, all valuations were graduated to a low standard. In 1638 it was enacted "that a laborer shall have twelve pence a day and his dyett, or eighteen pence a day without dyett, and not above, throughout the government." This law was repealed in 1639. Edward Gray

is recorded, by Dr. Thatcher, as the richest man in the colony. He lived a century later. He acquired an estate worth twelve hundred and fifty pounds.

² It is an old saying, that "virtue perfects herself by resisting assaults." "This is one of the reasons," says Montaigne, "why Epaminondas refused riches which fortune presented to him by very lawful means." "In order," said he, "to contend with poverty;"—in the extreme of which he maintained himself to the last. The choice of Epaminondas was one of judgment, but the position of the Puritans was that of necessity imposed by Providence.

provide for the voyage, and to insure a safe beginning in the wilderness. They had no common fund, except in a very limited supply of the actual necessities of life; and what was wanting in such property with a portion of the company was equalized by the skill and capacity of the planter and the mechanic. All rights being equal in regard to territory and property, there was no obstacle to an agreement that all rights should be equal in respect to privilege. The sovereignty of this little body politic was purely democratic, based upon the general good. All had a voice in its exercise; or, in other words, each individual exercised a sovereignty within himself, subjected only to the control of the majority. The majority principle is simply a rule of practicability, securing to a body of men an opportunity of action, numerically, according to the theory of entire equality. It is a practical adjustment of differences, after all have had an equal chance for influence. No person is counted more than one; no person can be counted less. A more perfect foundation for a democratic sovereignty cannot be conceived. If majorities abuse their right of action by neglecting the public welfare, or by transgressing the bounds of constitutional authority,—minorities should have a remedy in the practical application of the great principles which all admit without dissent or division. The sovereignty of the individual, however humble, is complete; and, in the exercise of the majority principle, the sovereignty of the body politic is preserved.¹ A considerate regard was extended to the weak in position, by equalizing their condition;² and the

¹ Let us dwell with M. Guizot for the moment, which he asks, and consider his attempt to prove a contradiction upon Rousseau. In his fifth lecture on the civilization of France, he says: "Most of you, of course, have read the *Contrat Social* of Rousseau; the sovereignty of number, of the numerical majority, is, as you know, the fundamental principle of the work; and Rousseau, for a long time, follows out the consequence of it with inflexible rigor. A time arrives, however, when he abandons them with great effect. He wishes to give his fundamental laws, his constitution, to the rising society. His high intellect warned him that such a work could not proceed from universal suffrage, from the numerical majority, from the multitude. 'A God,' said he, 'must give laws to men.' . . . It is not magistracy,—it is not sovereignty. . . . It is a particular and superior function, which has nothing in common with the human empire. And hereupon he sets up a sole legislator, a

sage; thus violating his principle of the sovereignty of number, in order to turn to an entirely different principle,—to the sovereignty of intellect, to the right of superior reason." *Hist. Civ.* Vol. I p. 387.

But, unfortunately, M. Guizot, in his endeavor to prove an inconsistency in the philosophy of Rousseau, commits the double error of misconstruction and misapprehension. He gives supremacy to a nominal logic, at the expense of actual reason. The sovereignty of number is a theory based upon the sovereignty of intellect. To view the subject in any other light, is an absurdity for which Rousseau is not responsible. Guizot does not seem to comprehend how the multitude can ever be raised to the dignity which belongs to intelligence. But this subject will be discussed more at length in future chapters.

² The conditions upon which the Pilgrims contracted with the Merchant Adventurers of London, as they were called, for their transportation to America, indicate the

planter was favored in a manner that insured a permanency in the settlement. The wants of the family were anticipated and provided for in view of population and uncertain contingencies; and what is usually placed at the mercy of interest was counted as a matter of serious public concern.

But, in considering the importance of the principle of equal rights as established by the Puritans, there is another element to be estimated in this connection, and that is the principle of integrity.

exhausted state of their pecuniary means, and would probably never have obtained their assent, under circumstances not imposed by absolute necessity. We place these conditions before the reader, that a just estimate may be formed of the "hard terms" upon which the emigration of our fathers depended, which were as follows:

1. The adventurers and planters do agree that every person that goeth, being sixteen years old and upward, be rated at ten pounds, and that ten pounds be accounted a single share.

2. That he that goeth in person, and furnisheth himself out with ten pounds, either in money or other provisions, be accounted as having twenty pounds in stock, and in the division shall receive a double share.

3. The persons transported and the adventurers shall continue their joint stock and partnership the space of seven years, except some unexpected impediments do cause the whole company to agree otherwise; during which time all profits and benefits that are gotten by trade, traffic, trucking, working, fishing, or any other means, of any other person or persons, shall remain still in the common stock until the division.

4. That at the coming there they shall choose out such a number of fit persons as may furnish their ships and boats for fishing upon the sea; employing the rest in their several faculties upon the land, as building houses, tilling and planting the ground, and making such commodities as shall be most useful for the colony.

5. That at the end of the seven years, the capital and the profits, namely, the houses,

lands, goods and chattels, be equally divided among the adventurers. If any debt or detriment concerning this adventure*

6. Whosoever cometh to the colony hereafter, or putteth anything into the stock, shall at the end of the seven years be allowed proportionally to the time of his so doing.

7. He that shall carry his wife, or children, or servants, shall be allowed for every person, now aged sixteen years and upward, a single share in the division; or if he provide them necessaries, a double share; or, if they be between ten years old and sixteen, then two of them to be reckoned for a person, both in transportation and division.

8. That such children that now go and are under the age of ten years have no other share in the division than fifty acres of unmanured land.

9. That such persons as die before the seven years be expired, their executors to have their parts or share at the division, proportionably to the time of their life in the colony.

10. That all such persons as are of the colony are to have meat, drink and apparel, and all provisions, out of the common stock and goods of the said colony.

These conditions, as we have observed, were reluctantly assented to, on the part of those concerned in the enterprise of emigration; but Mr. Cushman, their principal agent, as Gov. Bradford observes, "answered the complaints, that unless they so ordered the conditions, the whole design would have fallen to the ground; and necessity, they said, having no law, they were constrained to be silent."

*Some additional article was doubtless intended to be inserted.

THE PRINCIPLE OF INTEGRITY.

Were the Puritans honest? Was their practice in harmony with their professions? In other words, were they sincere? Without this element, democracy is nothing. Unless all the people are impartially protected, this great principle is violated. Without integrity, sovereignty can have no lasting existence. This is in the nature of things. Honesty has within itself the elements of self-preservation; dishonesty, the sure elements of self-destruction, or decay. What government is to a nation, as a protective institution, integrity is to government as a sustaining principle. It is the great principle of certainty,—the moral presence of man placed in the sublime relations of simple truth.

It will not be expected that any attempt should be made to prove the integrity of the Puritans, or to defend their acts. Should such a course be deemed necessary in any connection, it is quite certain that it is not embraced within the design of the present work. Besides, whoever has informed himself of their history with so little profit as to institute such an inquiry, is not likely to be influenced by mere expressions of opinion, when facts of an extraordinary nature have failed to produce conviction.

If viewed in connection with the events of a generation, or a century, integrity is a principle that cannot be mistaken. The grandeur of its development exists in its moral greatness, in sustaining man with an un-deviating certainty in the successive positions of progressive humanity. It marks the world of mind, as the planets mark the heavens. It is the basis of eternal order. It sheds a light by which it may be seen, and travels wide and open paths, which are perpetual. It is the continuity and permanency of moral principle,—the joining the present with the past, and the past with the future; or, in the language of philosophy, it may be denominated moral identity. It gave permanency to the will of the Puritans, and character to their motives. As an element of sovereignty, its importance can hardly be over-estimated. A slight deviation from its strict requisitions, in the beginning, would soon have proved fatal to the success of the colonists. In respect to all local questions this principle governed. The exercise of its influence, combined with habitual firmness, gave to them that peculiar austerity of character for which they became so distinguished. They permitted no deviation from their rules of practice, when not sanctioned by acknowledged tests of integrity. Their business was conducted in strict conformity to its requisitions; their habits were controlled in view of their professions, and their fashions were scrutinized with the same exact observance of moral harmony. When applied to government and combined with firmness, it was the spirit of integrity that enabled them to withstand the encroachments of power, so frequently attempted by England. They were strict constructionists,—even more. They were true not only to the letter of their charters and patents, but to the spirit of their

language, the circumstances of their origin, and to the great principles of Democracy.

Admitting, then, what all candid men must be willing to concede, that they were democrats in principle, the further inquiry remains to be answered, whether they were true to Democracy in practice. Were their institutions of justice, education and religion, calculated to sustain the sovereignty, the elements of which have just been considered? Were their laws of a character suited to the period, and of consistent tendencies?

It is a common error to speak of the institutions of a country as original sources of character. Their influence is not to be denied, nor their importance undervalued. Let them simply be understood in their obvious relations.

Institutions are shaped according to character already existing. They are good or pernicious, efficient or feeble, according to the wisdom with which they are projected and sustained. They indicate the true character of a people. What motives are to action, character is to institutions. In the one we find the cause; in the other, the corresponding effect. The institutions of the colonists were not the sources of their success or strength, so much as they were the results of their character, their Democracy. This may be said with singular propriety of their schools, and establishments for popular education.

POPULAR EDUCATION.

In no degree did the colonists relax their exertions in view of sustaining the great principles which they had so explicitly declared, and which were gaining strength in every advancement of knowledge. They began rapidly to discover the great power of knowledge. They evidently noticed progress in themselves at an early period, and it was natural that they should note the causes of prosperity which arose within the limits of a common experience. Not being conscious of ignorance, they could not suddenly be influenced by new considerations, even in regard to the importance of education. The age in which they lived^a was thought by some to be a learned one. They saw enough, however, to be persuaded that schools for the

When Glanville was elected Speaker of the House of Commons (1640), he referred, in his Speech to the King, to the *great learning* of that age. He said, "it is a learned age wherein we live, under your majesty's most peaceful and flourishing government: and your House of Commons, as it is now composed, is not only the repre-

sentative body, but the abstracted quintessence of the whole commonality, of this your noble realm of England; there be very many amongst them much fitter for this place than I am; few or none, in my opinion, so unfit as myself."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. II, p. 536.

people were as necessary for the security of posterity as reproduction is indispensable to the continuance of the race.¹

¹ Livingston, in his introduction to the Penal Code of Louisiana, gives credit to the early colonists of New England for establishing free schools such as had never been attempted in modern Europe.

The first free school in America was founded in 1621, in Virginia. The early proceedings of the colonists in regard to education have not been preserved. They extended their educational care even to the children of the Indians. Governor Craddock recommended to Mr. Endicott, in 1628, "that he train up some of the Indian children to reading and religion."

In 1635, *free schools* were commenced in Boston. A college was established in Cambridge in 1638; that, "so schollars might there be educated for the service of Christ and his churches in the work of the ministry, and that they might be seasoned in their tender years with such principles as brought their blessed progenitors into this wilderness." It was recommended to the several colonies, in 1645, to raise, by way of voluntary contribution, one peck of corn, or twelve pence money, or other commodity, of every family, "that so the college may have some considerable yearly healp towards their occasions." The foundation of the college, and the instruction of all the children in the English tongue, the capital laws, and the grounds and principles of religion, were among the first objects of attention in the Massachusetts colony. The college was sustained with energy, by frequent enactments, as an institution of the first importance, in every point of view. In 1642 the legislature gave their earnest attention to domestic education, and passed laws making the duty an imperative one. Common schools were established by law in Massachusetts in 1647. Since that time, not to keep and maintain the schools required by law has been an indictable offence. The following is an act of 1647:

"It being one chief project of Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the Scripture, as in former times keeping them in

unknown tongues, so in these latter times by persuading from the use of tongues, that so at least the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded and corrupted with false glosses of deceivers; to the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of our forefathers, in church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors;

"It is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that every township within this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their towns to teach all such children as shall resort to him to read and write, whose wages shall be paid either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supply, as the major part of those that order the prudentials of the town shall appoint; provided that those who send their children be not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other towns.

"And it is further ordered, that where any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, they shall set up a grammar-school, the master thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the university; and if any town neglect the performance hereof above one year, then every such town shall pay five pounds per annum to the next such school, till they shall perform this order"

The legislation of the colonies in respect to education was continued with consistent views and unabated interest to the period of the Revolution. The colonists shared the spirit of Milton, who said, "I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."—See *Coll. of N. H. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. IV; *Felt's Annals of Salem*; *Colonial Records of Connecticut*.

In education is to be found another and a very important condition necessary to the continuance and completeness of state sovereignty. The district school is a democratic institution, and, when considered in its near and remote bearings, is a subject of the greatest magnitude. It is to man what the orb of day is to the world,—a light that leads, and a power that saves. It may be termed the life-guard of thought and sentiment,—that principle of Democracy which opens to the soul new avenues to the future, and prepares the means for their immediate occupancy.

The axiom that "*knowledge is power*" is no new discovery. It is an infinite truth. For six thousand years, at least, it has been known to the few; and the consciousness of the existence of this magnificent truth has been one of the chief reasons why it has been kept from the many.

It is not well to turn upon the past with an arrogant spirit, to analyze the dark ages of man; as if they had been permitted, and not controlled, by Providence; as if it were possible that Almighty Power could cease for an instant in its beneficence, or fail to assert and develop the sublime and mighty relations of divine truth. This is not the spirit of philosophy, of patriotism, or of religion. Rather let the pages of the past be read as the lessons coming from Infinite Wisdom, illustrating the glories of truth by the absence of knowledge, the power of knowledge by the examples of ignorance, the blessings of knowledge by the practical results of its application. In God's own time, the destiny of man will be developed by human agencies, which, while they display his goodness, will elevate the soul; and while they exalt his power, will add energy to all the faculties.

The ancients, with extraordinary foresight of the power of knowledge, proclaimed, with oracular solemnity, that *self-knowledge* was of divine origin.

Truth profound!

How great the task! how infinite the theme!

Self-knowledge comprehends a consciousness of the varied powers of mind; their wants as connected with condition, their nature as the agents of control, and an acquaintance with external objects, as the aids of human progress.

Without self-knowledge, man remains ignorant of man. Rights would exist only in abstract propositions, and duty would be a theory subordinate to arbitrary power.

Historians of all nations are too much accustomed to speak of education as having been within the reach of the people. They employ language that is calculated to mislead the reader, and to perplex the thinker. They fail to make a distinction between individual examples of learning and a diffused intelligence among the people; between the love of knowledge and the possession of it. It is true the ancients prized it with as much enthusi-

asm as the moderns do ; but what would be counted much in one period, would be deemed insignificant in another. What was once called general diffusion, embracing only those who could read and write, and were in position, would be characterized in the present day as education for the aristocracy.

In ancient Rome, in the earlier ages of the commonwealth, it is asserted by historians¹ that the Roman matrons appreciated teaching as an honor. The general prosperity and peace of China have been ascribed to educational causes.² Guizot and others say, that from the first to the eighth centuries schools were everywhere numerous in France.³ Charlemagne is represented as a most ardent friend to education,—and yet he was unable to write his own name.

Prescott gives a glowing account of “Arabian scholarship, in the tenth and succeeding centuries, under a despotic government and a sensual religion.”⁴ Alfred of England, in the ninth century, is said to have enjoined by law all freeholders, possessed of two hides of land or more, to send their children to school ; and it is added that he had the satisfaction to see great changes in the face of affairs, before his death.⁵ Peter the Great is recorded as having established “schools in all the towns and little villages of Russia, where the peasants learned to read and write, which the very gentry could hardly do before.”⁶ And it is added by another writer, that the Emperor Alexander did much, in his reign, “to promote the general education ; and established several new universities, with large numbers of subsidiary schools.”⁷

These writers are not quoted with any disposition to make improper exception to their authorities, which seem to warrant such statements, but with a purpose to induce a more careful study of the nations referred to, in regard to the actual condition of the people. Historians owe it to themselves and to philosophy so to impart knowledge as not to violate the prerogatives of moral power. As a precocious child properly trained, is not

¹ Tytler, and others.

² Davis' China, Vol. I, p. 201.

³ Civilization in Europe, Vol. I, p. 849.

⁴ Ferdinand and Isabella, Vol. I, p. 285.

⁵ Hume, Vol. I, p. 75.

⁶ Eustaphie's Reflections, &c., p. 73.

⁷ The intelligence of the troops and the people of Russia may be inferred from an anecdote related by Schnitzler. At the time of the great revolt at St. Petersburg, soon after the accession of Nicholas to the throne, a revolution was attempted by Ryleieff and others, to which allusion has

already been made. The ostensible plan was to place Constantine upon the throne, which he had voluntarily surrendered in favor of Nicholas, and to insist upon a constitution. When the moment had arrived for declaring their standard, “to the cry ‘Hurrah for Constantine’ was added that of ‘Hurrah for the Constitution.’ The last word bears in Russ a feminine termination,—*Constitoutzia*,—and the ignorant men who heard it coupled with that of Constantine supposed it referred to his wife! The word *republic*, had it been pronounced, would not have been better under-

expected to be a dull man, so a nation that is early favored with extensive means of education is not expected to linger in the dark shades of ignorance as it advances to maturity. The practical teachings of the parable of the traveller, who gave a different number of talents to each of his servants, are as applicable to true philosophy as to religion.¹

The power of truth is certain. Knowledge is its great lever. Whatever else is clouded by the uncertainties of life, the light of knowledge has its conditions of progress, which may be calculated with as much moral accuracy as the elements of physical power. It is only necessary to look with scrutiny to the present state of England, France, Germany, Spain, Russia and China, to be persuaded that at no time whatever have the common people of those nations been blessed with a common-school education. They all have much to accomplish before arriving at such a position. The power of knowledge is still monopolized, and the people, though blessed with occasional glimpses of privileges which belong to them, are kept down by the machinery of governments, suited only to control an ignorant population.

As the stream is dependent upon its source, so all events, of whatever name or nature, are made subservient to truth. It has been eloquently said that "Diffused knowledge immortalizes itself."² Its presence prepares for its continuance. Its advancement discovers new agents, new labors, new duties. Its actual possession elevates all that has dignified man in the past, and gives birth to new conceptions and new motives, in view of the future. The education of Prussia, which opens the portals of truth to the subject, as a showman exhibits for pay,—that affords to the man a nominal possession of knowledge, without a title to the dignity which belongs to its uses,—is like giving light to the eyes of the blind, while manacles still fetter the limbs of the body.³ Yet, thanks to the monarch who acts with confidence, according to the light which surrounds him.⁴ He is preparing a crown for his royal descendants, which will outrival the brightness of the

stood. And the more reasonable cry which escapes in smothered sighs from many a Russian heart, 'Triumph to the cause of law and justice, and down with absolutism!' would not, if uttered to that audience, have been more intelligible."—*Secret History of Russia*, Vol. I, p. 240.

¹ Matthew 25: 14, 15.

² Sir James Mackintosh.

³ The position of the Prussian subject, in relation to his sovereign, is much like that which Solicitor Coke acknowledged to be his, when, as Speaker of the House (1592-3), he addressed her majesty Queen

Elizabeth, and said, "For as in the heavens a star is but 'opacum corpus,' until it hath received light from the sun, so stand I 'corpus opacum,' a mute body, until your highness' bright shining wisdom hath looked upon me, and allowed me."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. I, p. 860.

⁴ An intelligent writer says: "It was the successful assertion, by Martin Luther, of the right of individual conscience, the great principle of religious liberty, which led to the establishment of the parochial schools in Germany, the germs of the present school system of Prussia."

diamond,—the glorious wreath of freedom,—and which no power on earth can place upon the head but the hand of Democracy.

If it were a safe proposition for the Lord-Bishop of Durham, in 1603, that “correction without instruction is but a tyranny,” it requires but little prophetic boldness to predict that with instruction tyranny must ultimately cease;¹ and, it may be added, crime essentially diminished.²

Tyranny, which appears in the name of principle, has but a temporary mission, a transitory control. Its palaces become its sepulchres, its retreats of safety become its own dungeons of confinement. While it subserves a collateral end, it is inherently self-destructive.

All men, whether tyrants or patriots, love the power of knowledge. All bow to the magic spell of genius, to the sovereignty of mind. By all they are revered, but with opposite motives. By the tyrant, that he may increase his security, in being able to command the resources of those whom most he dreads; by the patriot, that he may extend to all that freedom which most he loves and craves. The man of ambition prizes no titles above the honors of a university; the people esteem no greatness above that which is to be seen in the defender of their rights, by his masterly exhibitions of knowledge. The miser, who habitually pinches the flesh with every exertion to sustain its vitality without the expenditure of his money, indulges in his first act of extravagance when he buys a roll of parchment upon which to record a will that conveys a title of all his savings to those institutions established to honor mind, and to multiply the means of knowledge. Such are the instincts of humanity in regard to those great principles of progress which are developed by education, and with which alliances by every class of mind are sought, to secure a fame that alone can be immortal.

The humble Peter Wentworth, when he claimed the right to exert his powers of knowledge in the House of Commons, in 1575, became the terror of her majesty, and of her majesty’s councillors. God help to keep in eter-

¹ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. I, p. 985.

² Of the nine thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine committed to the jails and houses of correction in Massachusetts, in 1850, only three thousand one hundred and seventy-five, or less than one-third, could read and write,—and that, too, while only one in a hundred of the people could not read and write; making about ten thousand per cent. in favor of education. Similar calculations in respect to the convicts of the different states show similar results, though the percentage in favor of education is much greater in Massachusetts than in any

other state. In view of such facts, the warden of the Ohio penitentiary, in a special report on prison discipline, made in 1851, said: “When it is considered that a very fruitful cause of crime is early orphanage, poverty and ignorance, the importance of penitentiary school-masters will be rendered at once apparent.” European statistics illustrate the same great truth, that crime can be lessened only by means of intellectual and moral culture.—See “*Western Journal*,” August, 1852, in which an article may be found on this subject, written by M. Tarver, Esq., the senior editor.

nal remembrance this ancient and faithful democrat.¹ How little has been done in the Old World, for the past three hundred years, to secure the freedom of speech claimed by this honest commoner, is sadly illustrated by the despots of France and Austria, who still multiply their soldiers, invest weak men and cowards with authority, muzzle the press, and banish their statesmen and philosophers. They tremble more in the active presence of a few of their gifted sons, than if they were threatened by all the armies of the world combined. In the one case, hope gives them many chances of success; in the other, none. It is easy to be seen, however, that in all the changes of tyranny darkness slowly recedes before the light of truth, and the people begin to see where they stand, what they are, what they are to do, and to grasp the power which is revealed by knowledge.

But knowledge and wisdom, without integrity and justice, are only partial agents of reform. It was a sublime truth of Solomon, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge."² This was the prevailing sentiment of the Puritans, when they evinced a greater confidence in their principles than in the strength of an army, and saw in their schools more enduring security for the defence of their rights than in the erection of walls and fortifications.³ In no respect, and in no condition, is the time misspent which is given to the contemplation of their modest yet profoundly wise beginning, in regard to the great subject of education.

But, as state sovereignty is sustained by the means of education, so far as a knowledge of principles and moral power is concerned, it is yet further dependent upon its agency in opening and enlarging the sources of national wealth, and stimulating the incentives to national enterprise. As knowledge is a nation's power, so industry is a nation's wealth. What education is to knowledge, knowledge is to industry. The one prepares the power, the other uses it.

The diversified products of the earth, their varied secondary combinations by the hand of art, their applications in the business of life, and fitness to meet the growing wants of society and of nations, are perpetual sources of great questions, which impose upon man the most sacred obligations to acquire practical habits of study. His position is one of vast responsibility. The lessons have been placed before him by an Almighty hand, and the treasures which each reveals can be possessed only by means of education.

The farmer is the tender of Nature's great machinery of production. His duties are not limited by his interests, his labors are not confined to his own wants. He belongs to a state which has its peculiarities of soil, climate and of production. He belongs to a Union made up of independent states,

¹ See page 102.

² Proverbs 1: 7.

³ It was a true remark of William Penn, "That which makes a good constitution must keep it; namely, men of wisdom and virtue,—qualities that because they descend not with worldly inheritance, must be carefully propagated by a virtuous education."

each having its own distinguishing ability, and each its own class of wants. He belongs to a world filled with men of different capacities, interests and passions, and fitted for labor as various as the tastes and necessities of man are numerous. To each and all of these he owes a duty, from the performance of which each and all derive a benefit. How noble is the stewardship, —how imperative the necessity of knowledge!

The mechanic and the manufacturer has each his circle of labor and skill. As the farmer should understand the philosophy of nature in the process of her productions, so should the mechanic and the manufacturer understand the philosophy of the productions of art. These are illimitable. Their origin may be traced either to the necessities of man, or to a knowledge of his wants and peculiar tastes. The arts and sciences are to be practically mastered; the elements are to be made his humble servants in relieving labor; the conditions of men are to be studied; the fashions are to be noted as they change, and the war of competition, that life-energy of enterprise, is to be waged with prudence, and yet with unremitting activity.

Hand in hand then come the merchant and the navigator. They are the great agents to supply the wants of the world. Every country is to be studied; every people is to be visited, consulted, understood and supplied. They gather for distribution, carrying to distant lands the products of their own country, and returning laden with the fruits and commodities of other zones, with fabrics made with other hands. History becomes a business topic, geography a directory, and man is found to be a subject of study, as an important element in successful enterprise. Commerce has been reduced to system, and is justly considered a national power.

In view of all these operations, of the unnumbered and changing copartnerships between mind and matter, between the elements and machinery, between the wants of one people and the wants of another, between the necessities and the luxuries of life, between the duties and the profits of business, another class of men, and by no means the least important, apply themselves to the study of forces, the philosophy of motion, of natural agents, the true economy of the mechanic powers. Inventive genius has been the helper of all nations, in all ages; but in no period has it accomplished so much as within that of the brief existence of American independence. In no country are its applications so various, so practically useful, as in the United States of America.

The farmer plants, reaps and gathers, by machinery. The mechanic saws, planes, carves, bores and drills, by machinery. And by machinery the manufacturer produces all those refinements of taste which give variety and elegance to the textures of cotton, wool and silk, and beautiful forms to the woods and metals. By the aid of the magnetic telegraph,¹ steam, and

¹ What shall be said of the magnetic telegraph, if Lamartine be admired for his appreciation of the art of printing? "Gutenberg," says he, "without knowing it,

the power-press, editors can gather news of the day from the extremes of the American continent and from foreign countries beyond the sea before they dine, and before they sleep scatter their reeking sheets to millions of their expectant readers. Merchants exercise an omniscient supervision of the great markets of the nation, and the surplus commodities of the day are taken to a distant state by the all-receiving cars, or carried by the steamships of the ocean to other continents, to other lands.

Mind is practically omnipresent. The boundaries of discovery no man will presume to limit; the possible achievements of art and science no mind is so reckless as to attempt to predict.

That "fact is stranger than fiction," is a saying now confirmed by ordinary experience. Indeed, language has become quite inadequate to the description of realities, and all people press, from the confines of the civilized world, to the mighty gatherings of a world's fair, to witness the wonders of invention, and to enlighten the darkness of an honest incredulity.

This is but a slight outline sketch of the world in its present state of activity. Men, states and nations, have alike become competitors in the great objects of industrial enterprise. Self-protection is seen to lie in self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is found to embrace man placed in relation to the external world, and in the responsible positions of subject and agent, as connected with a transitory and an eternal destiny. The elements of his nature have been considered in respect to the ends of government and of existence; the means of advancement have been studied in view of arriving at those conditions of safety which arise from knowledge, and of avoiding those conditions of danger, suffering and degradation, which result from ignorance and moral indifference.

In ascribing honor to the Puritans for their comprehensive views of the great importance of education, no more than simple justice is done to their principles of Democracy. Though they expected but little, they prepared for much; though their modesty was surpassed only by the earnestness of their piety, the aspirations of their highest ambition have been exceeded, and splendidly illustrated, in the events which followed them. What their descendants have accomplished and realized, has already become the theme of inquiry and amazement throughout the world. If by them education was looked upon as an important element to security, it cannot be viewed by the present generation otherwise than as a necessity. It has ever been, in all ages, a leading feature of Democracy, without which but little could be

was the mechanist of the New World. In creating the communication of ideas, he had assured the independence of reason. Every letter of his alphabet which left his fingers contained in it more power than the armies

of kings and the thunders of pontiffs. It was mind which he furnished with language. These two powers were the mistresses of man, as they were hereafter of mankind."—*Hist. of the Girondists*, Vol. I, p. 21.

accomplished, either for freedom or for happiness. The cause of education and Democracy should, in all countries, be considered identical; not for the few, but for the many; not for the rich alone, but for the poor; the best that can be commanded, and for all. Let the district school, the high school and the college, rise up everywhere throughout the broad domain of the American continent, as living monuments sacred to the memory of the Puritans who founded them, and as great instruments to preserve the liberty of their descendants.

Education may be regarded literally as the night-watch of freedom, the guardian angel of Democracy. It gradually discovers to the state the great sources of its power, the dangers of ignorance, the impenetrable safeguards of its sovereignty. It imparts a necessary knowledge of conditions without the observance of which no people can permanently thrive, or intelligently prosper. It enables the citizen clearly to understand the declarations of a constitution upon which rests the great AMERICAN UNION, and to take that comprehensive survey of men and things which recognizes a sovereignty in every state, and in all the states a NATION, that, in its functions of power and grandeur, knows "NO NORTH, NO SOUTH, NO EAST, NO WEST," and sees nothing in its objects "BUT A SACRED MAINTENANCE OF THE COMMON BOND, AND TRUE DEVOTION TO THE COMMON BROTHERHOOD."¹

THE LEGISLATION OF THE PURITANS.

The Legislation of the Puritans was of a nature to command implicit obedience. It simply consisted in the application of Bible authority to the varying conditions of the colonies. To them the Bible was government. They raised no questions, and permitted no liberties of construction. It was not *their* government, but the government of God. It was not a government for discussion, but one of blessed privileges and obedience; and as such was to be defended against the inroads of impious men in the colonies, and against dangerous heretics from abroad. The church was deemed the sacred depository of the safeguards of liberty, and was guarded with a watchfulness that knew no rest, and with a spirit that entertained no compromise. Theocratic rule is one of sentiment. It is based upon wisdom already acknowledged. It admits of no discussion. This is its nature. The wisdom of the Bible was viewed by the Puritans as a revelation from God, and as sufficient for humanity in all its wants and changes. This wisdom declared the principles of Democracy, and it was seized upon with inexpressible delight, as in harmony with all the higher sympathies of our common nature. What truth could be more glorious than that of equal rights? What happiness more complete than religious freedom? What

¹ Franklin Pierce.

protection more sure than a democratic sovereignty? What end more noble than the universality of privilege? Beyond this their imagination could not go. More than this their hopes had never promised, nor could their conceptions realize. They considered the Democracy of the Bible as self-protective, and that all its laws were adjusted to its principles.

Still, with these views as they supposed unalterably fixed, they did not hesitate to give form to scriptural authority, as connected with their wants and growing interests. Their first compact was a legislative act. In 1623, trial by jury was ordained by the court.¹ Their mechanics were forbidden to work for strangers.² In 1627, lands were equally divided by an act of the court.³ And, prior to 1636, a few other laws were made; but they were not of a character to illustrate any new principle, nor to show any departure from principles already acknowledged.

There was one law, however, enacted in 1632,⁴ which is worthy of remark, as tending to prove that the Puritans were not much influenced by love of distinction. It was made a penal offence to decline office. To decline office was not a new fact in history; but the fact, whenever found, is an instructive one. The element of ambition in the administration of government, whether present or absent, is always to be noted. Actuated by motives of ambition, man becomes an uncertain agent. With considerations in view

¹ "It was ordained 17 day of December An^o 1623, by the court then held, that all criminal facts, and all matters of trespasses and debts between man and man, should be tried by the verdict of twelve honest men, to be empanelled by authority in forme of a jury, upon their oath." This was re-enacted in 1636 and 1658.

² "It was further decreed, the day and year above written (29th March, 1626), for the preventing of such abuses as do and may arise amongst us, that no handy-craftsmen of what profession soever, as taylors, shoemakers, carpenters, joyners, smiths, sawyers, or whatsoever, w^{ch} do or may reside or belong to this plantation of Plimouth, shall use their science or trades at home or abroad, for any strangers or foreigners, till such time as the necessity of the colony be served, without the consent of the Governor and Councill; the breach thereof to be punished at their discretion."

³ See *Laws of the Colony of New Plymouth*, edited by Brigham, p. 29.

⁴ "It was enacted by public consent of

the freemen of this society of New Plymouth, that if now (January, 1632) or hereafter any were elected to the office of governor, and would not stand to the election, nor hold and execute the office for his year, that then he may be amerced in twenty pounds sterling fine; and in case refused to be paid upon the lawful demand of the ensuing governor, then to be levied out of the goods or the chattels of the said person so refusing.

"It was further ordered and decreed, that if any were elected to the office of councell and refused to hold the place, that then he be amerced in ten pounds sterling fine; and in case refused to be paid, to be forthwith levied.

"It was further decreed and enacted, that in case one and the same person should be elected gov^r a second year, having held the place the foregoing year, it should be lawful for him to refuse, without any amercement; and the company to proceed to a new election, except they can prevaill with him by entreaty."—*Brigham's Plymouth Laws*, p. 30.

of personal aggrandizement, it cannot be supposed that he is capable of being just to the rights and interests of others. Generally deficient in self-knowledge, his ignorance of others may be conjectured without danger of doing injustice. Human ambition, as generally understood, is unfavorable to integrity. What is not favorable to integrity is unfavorable to independence.

It is quite true that many reasons may be assigned for declining office. It is to be admitted that all men, more or less, are ambitious,—some in one pursuit, some in another. That the colonists may have had the ambition to become the possessors of wealth, and that all offices were looked upon by them as taxes upon persons, and not designed as distinctions of honor. But such a construction of motive is not warranted by the facts of history.

In times of feudalism, indifference to office may be accounted for by the jealousy existing between the nobles and the king. The power of the one is proposed to be increased by lessening the power of the other. In a badly-regulated monarchy, office may not be desired by a subject who is adverse to the government of the king. The honor is more than balanced by a required sacrifice of principle. Where government is absolute, and the sovereignty of the nation is controlled by a single mind, men of high character and proper self-respect may not be pleased with distinctions which are merely nominal, nor with positions that are of a doubtful dignity. In such examples, office may well excite aversion and disgust. With a Democracy the case is far different. There is an individual and state sovereignty to be protected. All have an equal interest; and, had the usual motives of ambition prevailed with the Puritans, their laws would soon have become unequal, foreign control would have increased, and the sovereignty declared by the compact would have been broken by struggles for place. The absence of this troublesome element, in the early formation of democratic institutions, is conclusive evidence of incorruptible integrity.

In 1636 the colonists began to have distinct conceptions of human legislation. They recited the compact of 1620, and reviewed their position in reference to England.¹ They declared their reasons for legislation, and

¹ Whereas at his Ma^{ties} court held the 4th and 5th of Octob^r in the 12th yeare of the raigne of our sovereign Lord Charles by the grace of God King of Engl. Scotl. Fr. and Irel. defender of the Faith, &c., it was ordered that Mr. William Brewster, Mr. Ralph Smith, Mr. John Done and John Jenny for the town of Plymouth; Jonathan Brewster and Christopher Wadsworth for Duxburrrough and James Cudworth and

Anthony Annable for Scituate should be added to the Gov^r and assistants as committees for the whole body of this commonweale, should meet together the 15th of Nov^r at Plymouth above menconed, and there to peruse all the laws, orders and constitucons of the plantacons within this government that so those that are still fitting might be established; those that time hath made unnecessary might be rejected;

cited their authority for enacting laws. They began to systematize their colonial government, to define private rights, public duties, and to provide penal securities. Property and trade became the subjects of regulation, alliances of offence and defence were made with the Indians,¹ a militia was established, and peace and war were provided for by statute. Towns were invested with authority to make laws, and grand juries were organized as the moral supervisors of the people. Benevolence extended to the poor the overflowing hand of charity, and misfortune found protection on the statute-book of the Puritans. Justice was administered with as much impartiality to the Indian as to the colonists, and equity was a principle as clearly registered in their laws as it was beautifully illustrated in their uniform execution.

Sympathy for the Indian has been a constant theme for the poet, the legislator, and divine. His claims to the soil of the continent, the sacredness of his home in the forest, his struggles for ascendancy, and the rapid decline of his race, have justly excited the spirit of the benevolent writer; and good men of every land have looked with melancholy interest upon the hand of fate, which has seemed to guide him to a premature grave and to a myste-

and others that were wanting might be prepared, that so the next court they might be established.

Now being assembled according to the said order and having read the combinacon made at Cape Cod the 11th of Nov^r 1620 in the yeare of the raigne of our late Sov. L. King James of Engl. Fr. and Irel. the eighteenth and of Scotland the fifty-fourth as also our letters patents confirmed by the honourable councell, his said Ma^{ty} established and granted the 13 of January 1629 in the fiftie year of the raigne of our Sov. Lord King Charles and finding that as free borne subjects of the state of Engl. we hither came endewed wth all and singular the priviledges belong to such in the first place, we thinke good that it be established for an act.

That according to the and due priviledge of the subject aforesaid no imposicon law or ordnance be made or imposed upon or by ourselves or others at present or to come but such as shall be made or imposed by consent according to the free liberties of the state and kingdome of Engl. and no otherwise, &c. Dated at New Plymouth, Nov. 15, 1636.

¹ The following treaty was made with MASSASOIT, March, 1621:

I. That neither he nor any of his should injure or do hurt to any of their people.

II. That if any of his did hurt to any of theirs, he should send the offender that they might punish him.

III. That if anything were taken away from any of theirs, he should cause it to be restored; and they should do the like to his.

IV. That if any did unjustly war against him they would aid him; and if any did war against them, he should aid them.

V. That he should send to his neighbor confederates, to inform them of this, that they might not wrong them, but might be likewise comprised in these conditions of peace.

VI. That when his men came to them upon any occasion, they should leave their arms (which were their bows and arrows) behind them.

VII. Lastly: That so doing, their sovereign lord, King James, would esteem him as his friend and ally.—*Morton's Memorial*, p. 54, *Davis' edition*.

rious oblivion. But while the sentiment of benevolence is to be honored, the higher reason must not be disregarded.

The natural world is filled with causes which man is fitted to develop and to know. The secret springs of vegetation; the healthful condition of vegetable life; the uses of things that grow and of inanimate substances; the objects of beauty and enjoyments of sense; the numberless purposes of animal life; the laws of matter and the elements of mechanical power;—in fine, whatever exists upon, within, around, above and beyond the globe, and the globe itself,—are subjects enjoined upon man for him to master, to control without abuse, and to advance in the great scale of perfection.

With views such as these, who can believe that the red man was the true inheritor of the American continent?—that such a magnificent country, with its vast capabilities, should be destined to the mere objects of animal life?—that it was to be the destiny of the savage to grovel forever with the beasts; to study destruction instead of life and growth; to roam over the land without a knowledge of its beauties, or of its latent treasures? Was this earth clothed in matchless beauty and endowed with rich treasures, adapted to humanity, forever to revolve in its orbit without development? Was it created without design, without destiny? To argue such questions, would be subjecting Providence to the trial of reason, judgment to the rule of doubt, and it would imply a total want of that awe and reverence which should ever characterize the spirit of inquiry, when the works of Infinite Wisdom are the subject of contemplation. The Indian was the steward of one talent. He buried it, and made no interest. “From him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath.” The white man is endowed with more talents, and they involve corresponding responsibilities.¹

Principle has its alliances with every form of wisdom; wisdom has its aids in every source of knowledge. Convictions of truth constitute knowledge; knowledge constitutes power. Men act from what they believe, and from what they know; and the certainty of action is coëval with the certainty of knowledge.

¹ It is an error to suppose that the colonists were unmindful of the interest of the Indian. Such an idea has prevailed to some extent, but is not sustained by the facts of history.

In 1633 the Legislature of Massachusetts passed an act for settling the Indians' title to lands in this jurisdiction. It prohibited the purchase of lands from the Indians, without license from the General Court. It declared and ordered, that what lands any of the Indians in this jurisdiction have pos-

sessed and improved, by subduing the same, they have a just right to; and, for the further encouragement of the hopeful work amongst them for the civilizing and helping them forward to Christianity, if any of the Indians shall be brought to civility, and come among the English to inhabit in any of their plantations, and shall live civilly and orderly, that such Indians shall have allotments among the English, according to the customs of the English in the like case. It further ordered, that if, upon good ex-

These propositions were as true two hundred years ago as they are to day. The Puritans of the seventeenth century were as wise, according to their knowledge, as the Americans are in the nineteenth; and their early legislation bears the marks of rapid progress.

In 1658, they reached another period for revising their laws. Their original motives are still recited, but they show them enlarged. The principle of Democracy is set forth with increased confidence. They appear to be conscious of having arrived at a position which really had not been anticipated, and they deemed an explanatory address important to the occasion. This document is well worthy of repeated perusal.¹

The next revision of laws took place in 1671. Here again Democracy is

perience, there shall be a competent number of Indians brought on to civility, so as to be capable of a township, upon their request, they shall have grants of lands undisposed of, for a plantation, as the English have; and still further ordered, that if any plantation or person of the English shall offer injuriously to put any of the Indians from their hunting-grounds or fishing-places, upon their complaint and proof, they shall have relief in any of the courts amongst the English, as the English have.—*Holmes' Annals*, Vol. I. p. 217.

The upright and respected Gov. Winslow, in a letter dated at Marshfield, May 1, 1676, observes: "I think I can clearly say, that before these present troubles broke out, the English did not possess one foot of land in this colony, but what was fairly obtained by honest purchase of the Indian proprietors. We first made a law that none should purchase or receive of gift any land of the Indians, without the knowledge and allowance of our court; and lest yet they should be streightened, we ordered that Mount Hope, Pocasset, and several other necks of the best land in the colony, because most suitable and convenient for them, should never be bought out of their hands."—See *Hubbard's Narrative*, and *Hazard*, col. II., 531—534.

John Adams was asked concerning the treatment of the Indians in New England, and he replied that he believed it to have been just. "In all my practice at the bar," said he, "I never knew a contested title to lands but what was traced up to the Indian

title."—*Holmes' Annals*, Vol. II, p. 151.

¹ The document was in the shape of an ADDRESS: TO OUR BELOVED BRETHREN AND NEIGHBOURS the Inhabitants of the Jurisdiction of New-Plymouth; The Governor, Assistants, and Deputies Assembled held att the General Court of that Jurisdiction, held att the Towne of Plymouth, the 29th of September 1658, wisheth Grace and peace in our Lord Jesus Christ.

It was the great priviledge of Israell of old, and soe was acknowledged by them, Nehemiah the 9th and 13. That God gave them right judgements and true Lawes; for God being the God of Order, and not of Confusion hath comaunded in his word, and put man into a capacitie in some measure to observe and bee guided by good and wholesome Lawes; which are soe fare good and wholesome, as by how much they are derived from and agreeable to the ancient Platforme of Gods Lawe; for although sundry particulares in the Judiciall lawe which was of old enjoyed to the Jews, did more espetially (att least in some Circumstances) befitt theire Padagogye, yet are they for the mayne soe exemplary, being grounded on Principles of Morall Equitie, as that all men Christians espetially, ought alwaies to have an eye therunto, in the framing of theire Politique Constitutions; And although several of the Heathen Nations whoe were ignorant of the time God and of his Lawe, have bine famous in theire times, for the Enacting and Execution of such Lawse as have proved profitable for the Government of theire Comon-wealthes in the times

reasserted with a formality belonging to the proper dignity of principles, under the imposing title of "The General Fundamentals."¹

The peculiar feature of this document, as compared to the previous ones,

wherein they lived; Notwithstanding their excellency appeared so far as they were founded upon grounds of Morall Equitie, which hath its Originall from the Law of God. And accordingly wee whose have bene Actors in the framing of this smale body of the Lawes, together with other useful Instruments whose are gone to their rest, can safely say both for our selves and them, that wee have had an eye primarily and principally unto the aforesaid Platforme; and 2ndarily, unto the right improvement of the liberties granted unto us, by our Superiors the State of England at the first beginning of this infant Plantation; which was to Enact such Lawes as should most befit a State in the Non-age thereof; not rejecting or omitting to observe such of the Lawes of our Native Countrey, as would conduce unto the good and growth of so weake a begining as ours in this wilderness, as any impartiall eye not fore-staled with prejudice, may easily discern in the perusal of this smale Book of the lawes of our Collonie: the premises duly considered, might work every consciencious spirit to faithfull Obedience: And although wee hold and doe asseure that both Courts of Justice and Magistrates, whose are the ministers of the Lawe are essentially Civill; notwithstanding wee conceive, that as the Magistrate hath his power from God, so undoubtedly hee is to improve it for the honor of God, and that in the upholding of his worship and service, and against the contrary, with due respect also to be had unto those that are really consienious, though differing and decenting in some smaller matters: But if any really or in pretence of conscience shall professe that which eminently tendeth to the Inundation of Civell State, and violation of naturall Bonds, or the overthrow of the Churches of God or of his Worship, that hee prudencie is to be improved in the Enacting and Execution of lawes.

It hath bene our Endeavor in the framing

of our lawes, that nothing should be found amongst them, but what will fall under the same particulares, wee have likewise reduced them to such order, as they may most conduce to our utilitie, and profit; possibly it may be that weakness may appear in the composure of sundry of them for want of such plenty of able Instruments as others are furnished withall: However lett this suffice the gentle Reader that our ends are, to the utmost of our power in these our Indeavours, to promote the common good both of church and State, both at present and for future; and therefore so far as we have aimed at the Glory of God; and common good, and acted according to God; Bee not found a Resister but Obedient, lest thereby thou resist the Ordinance of God, and soe incurr the displeasure of God unto Damnation. Rom. 13. 2.

By order of the General Court.

NATHANIAL MORTON Clarke.

¹ THE GENERAL FUNDAMENTALS. I. Wee the Associates of New-Plimouth, coming hither as Freeborn Subjects of the State of England, endowed with all and singular; the Priviledges belonging to such being Assembled; Do enact, Ordain and Constitute; That no Act, Imposition, Law or Ordinance, be made or imposed upon us, at present or to come; but such as shall be made or imposed by consent of the Body of Freemen or Associates, or their Representatives legally assembled: which is according to the free Liberties of the State of England.

II. And for the well-governing this Corporation; It is also Resolved and Ordered, That there be a Free Election Annually, of Governour, and Assistants by the Vote of the Freemen of this Corporation; and that none shall presume to impose themselves or any other upon us, but such as are so chose, according to the priviledge granted us by Charter.

is that in addition to the recital of principles, illustrations are given of their proper application. In 1685 another revision was found necessary, and some further principles, considered as *fundamental*, were declared.

III. That Justice and Right be equally and impartially Administred unto all, not sold, denied or causelessly deferred unto any.

IV. It is also Enacted, that no person in this Government shall be endamaged in respect of Life, Limb, Liberty, Good name or Estate, under colour of Law, or countenance of Authority, but by virtue or equity of some express Law of the General Court of this Colony, the known Law of God, or the good and equitable Laws of our Nation suitable for us, being brought to answer by due process thereof.

V. That all Trials, whether Capital, Criminal, or between Man and Man, be tried by Jury of twelve good and lawful Men, according to the commendable custome of England; except the party or parties concerned, do refer it to the Bench, or some express Law doth refer it to their Judgment and Tryal of other Court where Jury is not; in which case the party agrieved may appeal, and shall have Tryal by a Jury.

And it shall be in the liberty of both Plaintiffe and Defendent or any Delinquent, that is to be tryed by a Jury, to challenge any of the Jurors, and if the challenge be found just and reasonable by the Bench, it shall be allowed him, and others without just exception shall be impannelled in their room: And if it be in case of Life and Death, the Prisoner shall have liberty to except against six or eight of the Jury, without giving any reason for his exception.

VI. That no man be sentenced to Death without Testimonies of two witnesses at least, or that which is equivalent thereunto, and that two or three Witnesses being of competant age, Understanding and of good Reputation, Testifying to the case in question, shall be accounted and accepted as full Testimony in any case, though they did not together see or hear, and so Witness to the same individual Act, in reference to circumstances of time and place; Provided the

Bench and Jury be satisfied with such Testimony.

VII. And it is provided, as the supposed Priviledge of our Charter, that all persons of the age of twenty one years, of right Understanding and Memory, whether Excommunicated, Condemned or other, having any Estate properly theirs to dispose, shall have full power and liberty to make their reasonable Wills and Testaments, and other lawful Alienations of their Lands and Estates; Be it only here excepted, that such as are Sentenced for Treason against the Kings Majesty, the State of England, or the Commonweal; shall forfeit to the King or Colony their personal Estate, their Lands being still at their disposal.

VIII. That whereas the great and known end of the first comers, in the year of our Lord, 1620, leaving their dear Native Country, and all that was dear to them there; Transporting themselves over the vast Ocean into this remote waste Wilderness, and therein willingly conflicting with Dangers, Losses, Hardships and Distresses sore and not a few; WAS, that without offence, they under the protection of their Native Prince, together with the enlargements of his Majestys Dominions, might with the liberty of a good conscience, enjoy the pure Scriptural Worship of God, without the mixture of Humane Inventions and Impositions: And that there children after them might walk in the Holy wayes of the Lord; And for which end they obtained leave from King James of happy Memory and his Honorable Council, with further Graunts from his Gracious Majesty Charles the first and his Honourable Council, by Letters Patents, for sundry Tracts of Land, with many Priviledges therein contained for their better incouragement to proceed on in so Pious a Work, which may especially tend to the propagation of Religion, &c. as by Letters Patents more at large appeareth, and with further assurance also of the continuance of our Liberties and

The acts and laws of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, from 1692 to 1776, do not present any new development of legislative principle worthy of particular remark. As the other New England States were at first peopled from Massachusetts, her laws were the root of theirs.¹ The usurpation of Andros, the loss of the charter, and the modified government² which followed,

Priviledges, both Civil & Religious, under the Royal Hand & Seal of our Sovereign Lord King Charles the Second: And whereas by the good Hand of our God upon us, many others since the first comers are for the same pious end come unto us, and sundry others rise up amongst us, desirous with all good conscience to walk in the faith and order of the Gospel; whereby there are many churches gathered amongst us walking according thereunto.

And whereas (by the Grace of God) we have now had near about fifty Years Experience, of the good consistency of these churches, with Civil Peace and Order, and also with spiritual Edification, together with the welfare and tranquility of the Government;

It is therefore for the honor of God and the propagation of Religion, and the continued welfare of this Colony Ordered by this Court and the Authority thereof, That the said Churches already gathered, or that shall hereafter be orderly gathered, may and shall from time to time by this Government be protected and encouraged, in their peaceable and orderly walking, and the Faithful, Able, Orthodox, Teaching Ministry thereof, duly encouraged and provided for; together with such other Orthodox able Dispensers of the Gospel which shall or may be placed in any Township in this Government, where there is or may be defect of Church Order.

IX. And finally, it is Ordered and Declared by this Court and the Authority thereof, That all these foregoing Orders and Constitutions, are so Fundamentally essential to the just Rights, Liberties, Common good and special end of this Colony, as that they shall and ought to be inviolable preserved.

¹ Dane's Digest of American Law.

² The revolution in England forms an epoch in American history. The effects of

it were the most sensibly felt in the colony of Massachusetts. When the colonists resumed their charter in 1689, they earnestly solicited its reëstablishment, with the addition of some necessary powers; but the king could not be prevailed on to consent to that measure, and a new charter was obtained. Sir William Phips arrived at Boston in May, with this charter, and a commission, constituting him governor. He was soon after conducted from his house to the town-house by the regiment of Boston, the militia companies of Charlestown, the magistrates, ministers, and principal gentlemen of Boston and the adjacent towns. The charter was first published, and then the governor's commission. The venerable old charter governor Bradstreet next resigned the chair. After the lieutenant-governor's commission was published, the oaths were administered; and the new government thus became organized.

The province, designated by the new charter, contained the whole of the old Massachusetts colony, to which were added the colony of Plymouth, the province of Maine, and Nova Scotia, as far northward as the river St. Lawrence; also Elizabeth islands, and the islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. Under the old charter, all the magistrates and officers of state were chosen annually by the General Assembly; by the new charter, the appointment of the governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary, and all the officers of the admiralty, was vested in the crown. Under the old charter, the governor had little more share in the administration than any one of the assistants. He had the power of calling the General Court; but he could not adjourn, prorogue, or dissolve it. To such acts the vote of the major part of the whole court was necessary. The governor gave commissions to civil and military officers; but all such officers were

were circumstances of party. These will be noticed in another connection. The modification, though retarding in some degree the progress of the colonists, had the effect to direct their attention, with an increased interest to the study of their rights, and to add strength to previous resolutions in regard to their defence. The spirit of intolerance,¹ which has been so fre-

elected by the court. Under the new charter, there was to be an annual meeting of the General Court on the last Wednesday in May; but the Governor might discretionally call an assembly at any other times, and adjourn, prorogue, and dissolve it, at pleasure. No act of government was to be valid without his consent. He had, with the consent of the council, the sole appointment of all military officers, and of all officers belonging to the courts of justice. Other civil officers were elected by the two houses; but the governor had a negative on the choice. No money could issue out of the treasury, but by his warrant, with the advice and consent of the Council. Under the old charter, the assistants or councillors were elected by the votes of all the freemen in the colony; and were not only, with the governor, one of the two branches of the legislature, but the supreme executive court in all civil and criminal causes, excepting those cases where, by the laws, an appeal to the General Court was allowed. The new charter provided that, on the last Wednesday of May, annually, twenty-eight councillors should be newly chosen by the General Court or assembly. The representatives, under the old charter, were elected by freemen only. Under the new charter, every freholder of forty shillings sterling a year was a voter, and every other inhabitant who had forty pounds sterling personal estate. The new charter contained nothing of an ecclesiastical constitution. With the exception of Papists, liberty of conscience, which was not mentioned in the first charter, was by the second expressly granted to all. Writs having been immediately issued on the governor's arrival, the General Court met on the 8th of June. An act was then passed, declaring that all the laws of the colony of Massachusetts Bay and the colony of New Plymouth, not being repugnant to the laws of England, nor inconsistent

with the charter, should be in force, in the respective colonies, until the 10th of November, 1692, excepting where other provision should be made by act of assembly.—*Holmes' Annals.*

¹ The spirit manifested by William Penn, in regard to legislation, is worthy of especial notice. He seemed to lament the necessity of government, and, while he claimed a control as governor, he appeared unwilling to admit that the liberties of the people were in any degree abridged. In a speech, delivered April 1, 1700, at a meeting of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, he said:

“Friends, Tho’ this be a Colonie of 19 years standing, & not inferiour to anie of its age, yet wee have much to do to establish its constituon & Courts of Justice; there are in it some Laws obsolete, others hurtfull, others imperfect, y^e will need improvment, & it will be requisit to make some new ones; wee cannot go to slow to make, nor too fast to execute them when made, & y^e wth diligence & discretion, a few well made & duly executed, will better ans^{wer} y^e ends of governm^{ent} yn a greater bulk unexecuted. You friends are y^e the people’s choice & my Council; you’ll see what Laws are fitt to be Left outt & what to be made, & you wth mee, are to prepare & propose ym. I say this the rather becaus of a false notion some have gott y^e becaus you are my Council yrfor you are not y^e people’s representatives. The ablest men have always been chosen to be of y^e Council to prepare Laws, & y^e Assembly to consent to ym; wee are two bodies yet but One power, the one prepares, y^e other consents. Friends, If in the Constituon by Charter, there be anie thing y^e jarrs, alter itt; if you want a law for this or that, prepare itt; I advise you not to trifle wth govern^{ment}. I wish there were no need of anie, but since Crimes prevail govrm^{ent} is made necessarie by man’s

quently charged against the legislation of the colonists, will be considered in another chapter, where party issues will be traced to their original sources.

degeneraon; Itt's not an end but a means; hee y^r thinks itt an end aims at profit to make a trade on't. Hee who thinks itt to be a means understands y^r true end of govern^t. Friends, away w^t all pties, & Look on yo'selves & what is good for all, as a body politick, first as und^r y^r king & Crown of England, & next as und^r me, by Lres patent from y^r Crown. Att y^r Late election at philadelphia, I was grieved to hear some make itt a matter of religion, no its humane & moral relating to trade, traffique & publick good, consisting in virtue & justice; where these are maintained there is government indeed. Study peace, & be att unitie, cy y^r good of all, & I desire to see mine no otherwise than in y^r publick's prosperitie. The last Ass. wee made 2 Laws, the one ag^t piracie, y^r other ag^t forbidden trade. I hear they have not satt easie on y^r backs of some, but I hope, wee having yrin been carefull of England, wee shall have thanks for making ym before wee had orders so to do, and after so manie calumnies & complaints wee have been Loaded with, I hope these two Laws will in some degree wash us clean; what concerns myself I also Leave wt you to Consider. I have been now 19 years yo' pror & Governo', & have att my chairage maintained my deputie, qrby I have much worsted my estate, & hope itt will be no wonder to any to hear mee make this Llection of itt. Some say I come to gett monie & be gone, phapps they that say so, wish itt so. I hope I or mine shall be wt you, while I or they Live—The disasters of my absence have been mine as well as yours, & as I'm used shall make suteable returns. I have latelie two packetts from Whitehall, an original & a duplicate; also one to my Cosen Markham, & two from Secrie Vernon, & am Comanded by y^r Lords Justices to make Laws ag^t piracie and illegal trade. I am glad wee have prevented their Commands in doing it before they came."

Thereafter, a motion being made by a member of Council, that they might have a new Charter: Then y^r pror & Gor ask't whether they thought the Charter was Living, dead or asleep; is it vacated by y^r act of Settlement, or in what state is itt. A member made ans', that they never Look't on't to be void or dead, becaus att Go' Fletcher's coming, wee made a salvo of it in y^r assemblee books, & another salvo of it in y^r frame of govrmt, as to its fundamentalls, but y^r Circumstantialls of itt as to time, place and number, and rotation, wee could not reassume. Our bussines now is to do good, y^r Go' being here to confirm itt, & he having in his Charter, power to call us as hee pleases, ye manner is but circumstance, the meeting is essential; Letts take what's fitt & good both in y^r charter & frame, & Lett's make a Constituton y^t may be firm & Lasting to us & ours; This makes no breach on the old Laws; but will confirm what's reasonable, both in ym, y^r charter & frame.

Then y^r Gor said: The act of setlem, served till I came; now I'm come, It Cannot bind me ag^t my owne act, the charter it being my grant, & the people my wittness by y^r acceptaon of it, and tho' some violence cannot be resisted, yet when the violence is taken off, y^r Charter returns, & how can it return but by writt.

Therafter y^r pror & Gor resolved y^r whole members of Council into a grand Comittee, to meet hora tertia, p. m., to read y^r Charter & frame of govern^t, & to keep what's good in either, to lay aside what's inconvenient & burdensome, & to add to both what may best suit y^r Comon good, & if you be under any doubt Ile solve itt, & psent to mee what you do yrin to-morrow morning for my perusall.

Adjourned to 2^d April, 1700.—*Minutes of the Provincial Council*, Vol. 1, p. 568.

COLONIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Although the colonies were subjected to the nominal sovereignty of Great Britain, yet most of the early influences, privileges, restraints and institutions, established around them, were of their own choice and making. While they were willing to avail themselves of whatever advantages the mother country could extend to them, they did not hesitate to reject what their judgment could not approve, when proposed for their adoption; and their distance from all civilized nations was a circumstance favoring exemption from home rule, and stimulating that free exercise of all the faculties of the mind, in the discussion of their rights, which soon began to give them new traits of character, and which have been continued to their descendants.

Diversity of privileges, of interests, and of experience, was secured to them in the different forms in which Great Britain extended her laws and protection to the different colonies. The form of each became the study of all the others, and the results of each were separate, exhibiting the true causes of success or of failure.

The governments originally formed in the different colonies¹ were of three kinds, namely, the provincial, the proprietary, and the charter.²

1. *The provincial governments* had no fixed constitution, but derived all their authority from commissions issued from time to time by the crown. They were subject to the pleasure of the king. A governor and council were appointed, and these were invested with general executive powers, and were authorized to convene a general assembly of the representatives of the freeholders and planters of the province. The assembly was the lower and the council the upper house. The governor was invested with a veto power upon all their proceedings, and had the power to prorogue and dissolve them. The legislature had power to make all local laws and ordinances not repugnant to the laws of England. Under this form of government, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Georgia, were governed as provinces, at the commencement of the American Revolution; and some of them had been so governed from an early period of their settlement.

¹ The colony of Virginia was the earliest in its origin, being settled in 1606. The colony of Plymouth (united with Massachusetts in 1692) was settled in 1620; the colony of Massachusetts, in 1628; the colony of New Hampshire, in 1629; the colony of Maryland, in 1632; the colony of Connecticut, in 1635; the colony of Rhode Island, in 1636; the colony of New York, in 1662; the colonies of North and South

Carolina, in 1663; the colony of New Jersey, in 1664; the colony of Pennsylvania, in 1681; the colony of Delaware, in 1682; the colony of Georgia, in 1732. These dates refer to permanent settlements made under distinct and organized governments, and not to the earlier and disconnected settlements of the colonies.

² See "Republic United States"

2. *The proprietary governments* were grants by letters-patent, from the crown, to one or more persons, as proprietary or proprietaries, conveying to them not only the right of the soil, but also the general powers of government within the territory so granted, in the nature of feudatory principalities or dependent royalties ; possessing within their own domains nearly the same authority which the crown possessed in the provincial governments, subject, however, to the control of the king. The governor was appointed by the proprietary or proprietaries, and the legislature was organized and convened according to his or their pleasure. The executive functions and prerogatives were exercised by him or them, either personally or by the governor, for the time being. At the time of the Revolution, only three governments existed in this form, namely, Maryland, held by Lord Baltimore, as proprietary, and Pennsylvania and Delaware, held by William Penn, as proprietary.

3. *Charter governments* were political corporations, created by letters-patent, which conferred on the grantees and their associates the soil within their territorial limits, and all the high powers of legislative government. The charters contained a fundamental constitution for the colony, distributing the powers of government into three great departments,—legislative, executive and judicial,—providing for the mode in which these powers should be vested and exercised. The charter governments existing at the time of the Revolution were Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut.

It was a remark of the late Judge Story, that “ notwithstanding these differences in their original and actual political organization, the colonies, at the time of the American Revolution, in most respects, enjoyed the same general rights and privileges.” Although we may not dissent from this general remark, still it must be admitted that these differences are sufficiently marked to be noticed as distinct and separate causes ; and though their effects may have been blended in a common experience, we cannot but regard them as sources of different results, and, as such, leading in some degree to diversity of character.

The provincial government was the absolute sovereignty of the crown, transferred at pleasure from an island to the continent, without any guarantee as to favor or permanency.

The proprietary government gave an interest in the soil, but that interest was secured to individuals, and the relations between the people and the proprietaries were those of dependence.

The charter government was a division of powers between two great parties according to fixed conditions, each party having certain defined and reserved rights, the subordinate government being independent only under a constitution.

It will be perceived that in these forms of government there are three dis-

distinct degrees of liberty ; and yet the scale is graduated to a common head,—the British crown,—and to which all acknowledged their allegiance.

“ In all of these,” says Judge Story, “ express provision was made that all subjects and their children inhabiting in the colonies should be deemed natural-born subjects, and should enjoy all the privileges and immunities thereof. In all of them the common law of England, as far as it was applicable to their situation, was made the basis of their jurisprudence.” Not that the entire system was introduced into any one colony, but only such portions of it as each found adapted to its own wants, and were applicable to its own situation. Of this each colony judged for itself.

It is further remarked by the same author, that “ although the colonies had a common origin and common right, and owed a common allegiance, and the inhabitants of all of them were British subjects, they had no direct political connection with each other. Each colony was independent of the others, and there was no confederacy or alliance between them. They were excluded from all political connection with foreign nations, and they followed the fate and fortunes of the parent country in peace and war. Still, the colonists were not wholly alien to each other. On the contrary, they were fellow-subjects, and, for many purposes, one people. Every colonist had a right, if he pleased, in any other colony, to trade therewith, and to inherit and hold lands therein.”

Having thus taken a rapid survey of principles, the inquiries still remain to be pursued,—In what way, and by what means, were these principles applied by the colonists, and what were their natural or legitimate results? These subjects are yet to be considered.

PERIODS OF PARTY—RESULTS OF PARTY PRINCIPLES.

It is much with parties as it is with men,—they have their distinctive principles, periods of thought, periods of development, periods of action, periods of failure, and periods of success. Whatever is true is successful or progressive ; whatever is just is permanent or certain. Every period of development is limited or extended according to the nature or magnitude of the truth to be made manifest, and is closed by results which are recognized by a common judgment, and incorporated into a common experience.

As every period is characterized by its peculiar events and opinions, it is found to be marked by corresponding and systematic endeavors. Its plans are matured, tested and completed ; and, as representative men are to be seen in individuals, representative parties may be found in communities.

Parties are permanent in their nature, but progressive in their action,—organizing and reorganizing in regard to the necessity of new wants, or the adoption of new truths. The church has its periods of reformation, correcting abuses and reconstructing creeds ; but the principles of religion remain

the same. Science stands like a mountain of truth, to be levelled and applied to the condition of man by the schools of intellect, each having its periods and generations of partisan activity. Governments have their periods of activity, either to illustrate the evils of absolutism, or the benefits of freedom; while the principles of Democracy remain unchanged. Industry has its questions of protection; commerce its questions of extension; territory its questions of control or division; and currency its complicated questions of adjustment;—each interest, and each question of every interest, requiring a particular period for asserting fundamental principles, for experimental demonstration, and passing through the ordeal of party.¹

The improvement of man does not imply a change of nature, nor does progress necessarily indicate a change of principle. The same principle admits of numberless applications; the same idea is continued, and placed in new and instructive relations. As the generations of men mark the periods of a race, so the tests of experience mark the periods of mind.

The events of life, whether of a private or of a public nature, are to be classified, and considered as illustrative of wisdom or of folly, according as they are shaped by a sound judgment, in view of a common good, or by a reckless habit, guided by no motive above that of a sordid interest or a passive indifference. Where wisdom prevails, society is elevated or advanced; where folly or ignorance rules, society becomes depressed or degraded. Reference is not made to individual examples, nor to limited periods of time, but to the prevalent habits of a people, by which they become characterized through successive and uninterrupted generations. Without a general success, decay is certain; without a greater regard for truth than error, advance is impossible. A community thrives and prospers by its industry and frugality, or it becomes weakened or ruined by its idleness and shameless neglect of duty. A nation increases its power by the adoption of just principles of government, and becomes respected; or it falls by following the counsels of imbecile rulers, and becomes the subject of misrule and the object of contempt.

It is thus with political parties. Although they are formed to-day, as it were, of men of similar views, sympathies, tendencies of disposition and of mind, they have their perpetual succession.² They are not to be considered

¹ "Human power," says Baron Humboldt, "can only manifest itself in any one period, in one way, but it can infinitely modify this manifestation; at any given epoch, therefore, it betrays a single and one-sided aspect, but in a series of different periods these combine to give the image of a wonderful multiformity. Every preceding condition of things is either the complete and sufficient cause of that which succeeds it,

or, at least, exercises such modifying influences that the external pressure of circumstances can procure no other."—*The Sphere and Duties of Government*, p. 193.

² It is a remark of Bancroft, that "The contest of parties is the struggle, not between persons, but between ideas; and the abiding sympathy of nations is never won but by an appeal to the controlling principles of the age."—U. S. VOL. III, p. 322.

as transitory combinations in respect to particular questions of polity or interest,—of a certain people in a particular age,—but as permanent representatives of fundamental principles. Party is not without its pedigree; and the occasional departures from great immutable principles afford the most conclusive evidence of the fact. These distinctions are given in a former chapter.

As political parties are formed with distinct and direct regard to measures of national tendency and results, they should be tried by a standard of corresponding extent, embracing principles which comprehend the causes and indicate the conditions of things. Party measures, designed for national advancement, sometimes require long periods of time for development. Prejudices are to be overcome, interests adjusted, opinions revised, and new habits of thought and practice tested and established. All this is the slow work of time; and to be persuaded that such a process is constantly going on among the people, it is only necessary to review the events and opinions of the past, and compare them with those of the present. The inquirer will not only see great changes of opinion, but will discover that principles always remain the same. He will find that party, like the atmosphere which surrounds the globe, and visits its surface with every degree of power, from the gentle zephyr to the furious tempest, has its fixed laws and boundaries. The same law that vibrates the strings of the Æolian lyre prostrates the forest; the same vital element that affords life to the invisible mite is alike indispensable to the man.

THE POLITICAL PARTIES OF THE COLONIES.

In reviewing the political parties of the colonies, it will be necessary to consider their peculiar relations. The difficulties of such a study cannot be appreciated by any one who has not attempted to analyze historically the colonial events and measures of America. Though these remarks must be general, it is hoped that they may be sufficiently definite to enable every reader to classify and apply the facts afforded by history. When facts are but slightly and imperfectly recorded by the historian, it is more profitable to select such for illustration and instruction, with a distinct standard of principle in view, than to vex and fatigue the mind with disconnected details, which mean nothing and teach nothing.¹

¹ The intelligent author of "*Rule and Misrule of the English in America*" has alluded to the "want of continuity" in American Colonial History. He says: "The early settlements made by the English in America were effected either by individual speculators or associated companies. They were in general situated at a distance from each other, having at first little or no connection, either political, social or commercial, among themselves, and deriving but trifling assistance, and less protection, from the mother country. They grew up into powerful colonies, in neglect and obscurity,

The principles of the colonists, and the events of their emigration, have been briefly considered; and the inquiry now arises,—In what way their principles were practically applied, and by what means their institutions were gradually established, and permanently sustained? In arriving at the conclusion that they were led to people the New World by the spirit of Democracy, the reader will naturally be prepared to find that they were animated and encouraged by the same spirit in the wilderness. In this he will not be disappointed. Although the Puritans could not divest themselves of humanity, nor free themselves from that diversity of disposition which is incident to all society, however limited, yet they were placed in position as a dominant party, and were enabled to control the results of an independent judgment, and to direct them in channels of their own choice, and shaped to ends of their own conception. As their numbers were insignificant at the beginning, they were viewed indifferently as subjects, though with sufficient concern to require from them one-fifth part of all the *gold* that they should find; and, as a security rather that the crown might share with them a portion of their profits, though in no way to be held for their losses, they were required to be true to their sovereign, and to the acts of Parliament. They were regarded as troublesome levellers,—a faction of heretics,—and were in no respect, for a single moment, counted as a party, or the nucleus of a party to control the nation. They were going where they could neither make allies for power, nor converts for influence. As for themselves, in view of the established church, no subjects could stand worse; and government indulged in no serious hopes that they would ever become better.¹ Their professions of principle were looked upon as dangerous and delusive assumptions, and their untiring zeal as the infection of Satan. Hence, the further removed, the safer for the faithful. Nevertheless, this insignificant band represented the Democratic Party of Great Britain;—not its interests, but its principles; not its subserviency, but its independence. The colonists were party-men in England; they did not cease to be party-men in America.² As they brought with them no important interests to defend, they

with a rapidity and vigor that astonished Europe. They were without precedent in the previous annals of England, and the political agitation of the public mind in the present state unhappily afforded no opportunity for establishing their relation on a proper foundation, or arranging a consistent and uniform plan for their government. The accounts we have of them, therefore, are detached, and their interest is destroyed for want of continuity. Every plantation has had its annalist; but the narratives are too local, too minute, and too similar in

their details, to be either interesting or instructive."

¹ "I had rather live like a hermit in the forest," said King James, "than be a king over such a people as the pack of Puritans are that overrules the lower House."

² It is not deemed necessary, in these general remarks to make a distinction between those who settled at Plymouth, and those who settled at Massachussets Bay. Although different in station and means, most of them were of the same political views.

employed their mental energies in fortifying their principles. As they looked to no Parliament for protection, they feared no Parliament for restraint. They were alone, and, at the beginning, united; and yet in no degree did they abandon their habits of party vigilance, or lessen their spirit of party jealousy. Separated and essentially freed from the iron control of a powerful government sustained by a powerful party, they erected a new standard of advancement, by immediately reducing their principles to practice, and by establishing and occupying new outposts, to guard their rights against future dangers. Relieved from the crushing weight of arbitrary power, they were able to stand upright before their Maker in their native strength, and to study with a manly spirit the grandeur of their new position, and to realize those expanding views which truth inspires and freedom permits. Placed in new relations, new objects were presented for contemplation; laboring in unincumbered positions, enlarged obligations imposed new duties. Withdrawn from the overshadowing influence of a ponderous monarchy, and sheltered from the glare of royalty, they were, for the first time, enabled to look upon the simple framework of Democracy, and to study with uninterrupted composure its foundations, its columns of support, its braces, its symmetry, its beauties and its wants. Exempted from the pressure of the Courts of High Commission, and from the sleepless eye of a Bishops' Bench, they could now study the prophets with boldness, and the apostles with unrestrained devotion. Their church, now placed upon a hill, and viewed away from the dim cathedral-light of power and ceremony, appeared more beautiful than ever in the broad sun-light of heaven,—presenting new aspects of truth, and familiar truths in new relations of sublimity. Endowed with different capacities, and blessed by attainments varying in degree and kind; representing different races, nations, habits and motives; placed in new points of observation, and left to the free exercise of their reflective faculties,—it is not surprising that some of the colonists should think more and feel less, while others would feel more and think less, and thus begin a new line of division, and manifest still the spirit of party in adjusting new issues, or in the new application of acknowledged principles. Such a result was natural; and, when viewed in reference to all the circumstances of their condition, their wants and their hopes, it will be found to have been their greatest source of safety, their surest means of progress. As their relation to Great Britain was still one of a party nature, and they were liable to the inroads of further emigration, their party discipline, within their narrow circle, became, of necessity, not only of the strictest kind, but in its nature exclusive. In them intolerance became a virtue,—an imperative condition of existence. That is, they could permit no habits, no opinions, no discussions, but such as were safe for them in their critical and unfortified position. To have conceded less would have

been difficult; to have conceded more, dangerous.¹ Such was their judgment. They commenced by making sure a democratic platform, and within its limits they were ready for labor and for action. Here they desired to stop, that they might build up to the standard which they had already erected. They had no time for change, or for mental contest among themselves. They were sufficiently agreed to be united in their chief purposes, and content to be controlled by a compact that secured to them equal rights and equal privileges. Democracy was to be preserved, rooted, cultivated and strengthened, so that it might be applied to more extended interests, and be employed to open new sources of light and influence.²

It may be well in this connection to note the distinction to be observed

¹ "The character and education of the leading men, both of Plymouth and Massachusetts, was such as to fit them for the enterprise which they undertook,—to form a religious and political society, founded in the equal rights of men, and in obedience to God as their supreme law-giver and governor. Their distinguishing trait of character was a sacred regard for divine revelation, united with the conviction that civil government was essential to social order and justice. But republican or democratic principles were recognized in their full extent. The whole body of the freemen were to choose magistrates, and make the laws in person, or by their deputies; and every attempt to evade this principle was early opposed and suppressed. Their zeal for religion, and for the support of Christianity, was generally wisely tempered by their knowledge of human nature, and of the importance of civil authority. The condition of their native country had served to prepare them to be political as well as religious guides. Brewster, Bradford, Winslow and Prence, of Plymouth, and Winthrop, Bellingham, Ludlow, Dudley, Nowell, Pelham, Pynchon and Bradstreet, were qualified, from their knowledge and experience, to direct the affairs of civil government. If they differed, in some of their enactments and policy, from the old governments of Europe, it was not through ignorance or fanaticism, but from a reference to their peculiar situation, and from a supreme regard to the divine authority. All the freemen were on a level, and, therefore,

had equal rights; and a less strict discipline than was adopted towards strangers and intruders would have subjected the infant colony to confusion and misrule, if not to an entire overthrow."—*Bradford's Mass.*, p. 31.

² The horror of toleration in the early part of the seventeenth century was hardly to be limited. Bossuet, in France, the illustrious champion of the Church of Rome, the Scotch Commissioners in London, the English Presbyterian clergy in their official papers,—all were violently opposed to the introduction of a "sinful and ungodly toleration in matters of religion." "My judgment," said the moderate Baxter, "I have always freely made known. I abhor unlimited liberty, or toleration of all." The distinguished Edwards, who lived at a later period, said, "Toleration will make the kingdom a chaos, a Babel, another Amsterdam, a Sodom, an Egypt, a Babylon. Toleration is the grand work of the devil, his master-piece and chief engine to uphold his tottering kingdom. It is the most compendious, ready, sure way to destroy all religion, lay all waste, and bring in all evil. It is a more transcendent, catholic and fundamental evil. As original sin is the fundamental sin, having the seed and spawn of all sins in it, so toleration hath all errors in it, and all evils."—See *Verplanck's Discourses*, pp. 23, 24. Surrounded by such an atmosphere in the world of mind, a community more tolerant than the colonists would have been crushed by the external pressure of the spirit of control.

between the conservative *principle* and the conservative *party*. The conservative principle is one of the conditions of growth—growth of every kind. It is the union or concentration of parts which belong together, and which make a perfect whole. The great error of the conservative *party* consists in the misapplication of the conservative principle. To limit, when extension is demanded, to be silent, when silence is treason; and to withdraw or turn back, when progressive action is needed.¹ In Democracy, this principle leads to the maturity of measures, which in themselves are of a progressive nature, each measure requiring a particular period for development or completion. It protects individual rights against conventional control; it protects the town against the encroachments of the state; it protects the state against the nation,—and the nation against the world. It protects experimental measures against premature judgment, and private interests from the abyss of public indifference. As the spirit of progress is the natural barrier to consolidation, it is the abuse of this principle which leads to it. While it tends to unite the parts in their natural harmony, in particular things, it is the spirit of progress which recognizes a system of which all these things are but parts. Applied with judgment, it becomes a maturing process; when adopted as a leading principle, it reduces the parts, and fails to produce a perfect whole.

The beginning and the slow growth of the American colonies discover every variety of circumstance and character necessary to a causative diversity, and in these may be found all those elements of humanity which lead to party formations, and tend to develop the true sources of national success. It required but little of the learning of Lord Bacon to enjoin patience on “all who would plant colonies;” but, to understand the laws and conditions of their fluctuating growth, would seem to demand the aid of his genius.

Virginia and Massachusetts have been aptly designated as *the mothers of States*. This significant appellation is not without truth; and it becomes a subject of interesting inquiry, in what respect and in what degree it is an instructive one. With various motives, and under various impelling influences, the people of Virginia extended their settlements on the Ohio and the Tennessee.¹ The intolerance of Massachusetts helped the growth of the Plymouth Colony; banished Williams to become the founder of Rhode

¹ The errors of the two great parties are thus defined by Lord Bolingbroke, who, in speaking of the Whigs (Democrats) and Tories of England, says,—“Both (parties) saw their errors. The tories stopped short in the pursuit of a *bad principle*. The Whigs reformed the abuse of a *good one*.”

Without any reference to the particular application of this remark, it affords some idea of the difference between the errors of the Democratic party and the errors of the Conservative party, so far as they may be classified.

² Bancroft, Vol. IV, p. 168.

Island;¹ diverted Davenport, Eaton and Hopkins, to Quinnipiac,² where Connecticut was commenced; and sent Wheelwright, who was excluded for

¹ Roger Williams arrived in America on the 5th of February, 1630—31. He was settled as a minister of the gospel at Salem and at Plymouth. He was soon accused of heresies, and was repeatedly summoned to appear before the General Court, at Boston. In July, 1635, at a meeting of the General Court, he was charged as having uttered the following "dangerous opinions," namely: "That the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table, otherwise than in such cases as did disturb the civil peace; 2, That he ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate man; 3, That a man ought not to pray with such, though wife, child, &c.; 4, That a man ought not to give thanks after the sacrament, nor after meat, &c." These dangerous opinions excited much feeling, and elicited much discussion; and the result was a vote of banishment, at a meeting of the Court held in October of the same year. The sentence was in these terms: "Whereas Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the church of Salem, hath broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates, and also writ letters of defamation, both of the magistrates and churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without any retraction; it is therefore ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction, not to return any more without license from the Court." He became the founder of Rhode Island.—See *Winthrop*, VOL. I, pp. 151--171.

In a letter of the late Gov. DORR, of R. I., to the author, in 1853, he says,—“Roger Williams was the Father of American Democracy, and the first in all time to promulgate the true doctrine of entire religious *liberty*,—not toleration, which implies a superior and a right to persecute.” Another letter to the author, from ISAAC DAVIS,

LL.D., Worcester Mass.,—in 1871, contains the following interesting passage: “Religious liberty in America was established by Roger Williams and his associates. Roger Williams was born in Wales in 1599, was graduated at Oxford University under the patronage of Sir Edward Coke. He came to America, landing at Boston, February, 1631. He was banished from Massachusetts on account of his sentiments on religious freedom in Oct^o. 1635. He fled out of the jurisdiction to Naragansett Bay, and established a settlement there, which he called Providence. In 1639 he formed there a Baptist Church, the first in America. He inculcated the great doctrine,—‘That civil rulers had no power or authority to *proscribe, enjoin or regulate*, religious belief.’ This doctrine is now recognized throughout the United States. Thomas Jefferson was appointed Chairman of a Committee in the Continental Congress of 1776, to draft a Declaration of Independence. He reported that wonderful document which was adopted by Congress, July 4, 1776. When President of the United States, he was asked where he got his notions of *liberty, equality*, and independence, contained in the declaration? He answered, from a little Baptist Church in the vicinity of Monticello. Every Baptist Church is a pure democracy,—where all have equal rights in voting and regulating their affairs. They choose their pastor without the interference of any other power.”

² A new company for emigration was formed in England in the year 1636, chiefly through the efforts of Theophilus Eaton, John Davenport, and Edward Hopkins. They appear to have determined, before leaving England, on no particular place for settlement; but sailed for Massachusetts, and arrived June 26, 1637, reserving the selection of a place of abode till after their arrival. Inducements were held out to the company to fix their residence in Boston, and, likewise, to unite with the original

his dangerous heresies of non-conformity, to begin a settlement at the falls of Squamscot,—the germ of New Hampshire.¹

Thus it will be found that party spirit, in its extreme acts of exclusion, is not without its benefits ; and while one principle is fortified and sustained by unity, another may be equally promoted by discord and diversity. Bigotry is not alone to be found in the established church, nor in the religious world. It is an element of character inharmoniously developed in the human mind, more or less in all the departments of thought and sentiment. It may be termed an isolated consciousness of self appreciation without regard to facts or the convictions of other minds. The bigot is not so indolent as Cowper would make him, nor so insignificant as represented by Pope. According to the former,

“To follow foolish precedents, and wink
With both our eyes, is easier than to think.”

While the latter, unwilling to recognize the importance of orthodox zeal, says,

“For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.”

The Christian, the infidel, the pagan, may be a bigot, but the character, though more consistent with some creeds than others,—is not necessarily derived from any particular faith.

If the settlement of a vast continent were surrendered entirely to the influence of the social principle, and made to depend upon the harmony of views, it is obviously certain that it could never be accomplished. All dissenters would be compelled to leave ; and those who were united in so partial a manner would seek the narrowest limits, and study the narrowest policy. Sources of enterprise and wealth would remain undiscovered, and many of the means of advancement in the refinements of society would remain unknown. But, in adopting this conclusion, the reader is not to infer that it warrants any purpose of intentional non-conformity. For such a construc-

colony at Plymouth ; but they most probably entertained, from the first, a wish to begin, if possible, a new settlement. It is certain that they were not altogether pleased with the state of things in either of the colonies already planted. After visiting various places, they decided in favor of Quinnipiac, now New Haven,—for which place they sailed from Boston on the 30th of March, 1638, and in about a fortnight arrived in safety.—See *Prof. Kingsley's Historical Discourse*, 1838. See APPENDIX I.

¹ In 1638, the Antinomian controversy, at Boston, had occasioned a violent strife

and schism. It terminated in banishing from that colony the principal persons who bore that name of reproach. Conspicuous among the exiles were the learned and truly pious Wheelwright, and his famous sister, Anne Hutchinson. They had before purchased some lands of the Indians at Squamscot Falls, and now came, with the few friends who followed them into banishment, and began a plantation. They called it Exeter ; and here was laid the foundation of New Hampshire. — See *Barstow's History of New Hampshire*, p. 40 ;: *Trumbull's Connecticut*, vol. 1, p. 6.

tion breaks down all proper distinction between the will of man and the events of Providence. Such a truth indicates the proper course of study,—the investigation of things according to their nature,—the understanding of man, with a distinct knowledge of his faculties, and of the laws by which they are governed. The adoption of any other one principle, to be followed out, according to its distinctive nature, would be attended with like delusive results. Although single ideas require special means for development, it cannot be expected, by any considerate man, that they are to be successfully advanced except in harmony with the general condition and wants of society.

In tracing the events of freedom, as recorded in the various histories of the American colonies, and in attempting to point out some of the party means by which that freedom has been preserved, enlarged and continued, it is not with any motive to commit the error complained of by Sir James Mackintosh,—to establish the “pedigree of freedom,”¹—but rather to show, that in no period of time have nations been exempted from party spirit, and that the great and progressive cause of liberty has been in the keeping of the Democratic party. Imperceptibly small it may have been, at times, but always present,—in a spark to kindle, or in a blaze on the hill-tops of a nation,—to gladden everywhere the mighty heart of humanity.

But let us take a rapid survey of colonial events, scattered upon the pages of imperfect records ; and as the waters of the bubbling spring and mountain brook glisten on their way to the majestic river, so let us endeavor to catch an occasional glimpse of those gushes of freedom which shine between the dark intervals of tyranny, and finally widen and unite in the broad, deep and

“A pleader at the Old Bailey who would attempt to aggravate the guilt of a robber or a murderer, by proving that King John or King Alfred punished robbery and murder, would only provoke derision. A man who should pretend that the reason why we have right to property is, because our ancestors enjoyed that right four hundred years ago, would be justly condemned. Yet so little is plain sense heard in the mysterious nonsense which is the cloak of political fraud, that the Cokes, the Blackstones, and the Burkes, speak as if our right to freedom depended on its possession by our ancestors ! In the common cases of morality, we should blush at such an absurdity. No man would justify murder by its antiquity, or stigmatize benevolence for being new. The genealogist who should emblazon the one as coëval with Cain, or stigmatize the other as upstart with Howard, would be disclaimed even by the most frantic partisan of aristoc-

racy. This Gothic transfer of genealogy to truth and justice is peculiar to politics. The existence of robbery in one age makes its vindication in the next ; and the champions of freedom have abandoned the stronghold of right for precedent, which, when the most favorable, is, as might be expected from the ages which furnish it, feeble, fluctuating, partial and equivocal. It is not because we have been free, but because we have a right to be free, that we ought to demand freedom. Justice and liberty have neither birth nor race, youth nor age. It would be the same absurdity to assert that we have a right to freedom because ‘the Englishmen of Alfred’s reign were free,’ as that three and three are six because they were so in the camp of Genghis Khan. Let us hear no more of this ignoble and ignominious pedigree of freedom !”—*Works*, vol. III, p. 135.

uninterrupted stream of liberty,—to be seen in the enjoyment of equal rights, and in the dispensation of impartial justice. As the tendency of all matter is downward, attracted by unalterable laws which unite and functionize its properties, so the tendency of the spirit of freedom is upward, outward and onward, gradually releasing the soul of man from the weight of its fetters, and preparing it for still higher duties, a more exalted happiness. Every blow struck by the Democratic Party severs a link from that ignoble chain so long ago forged by tyrants, and guarded by their successors.

As the colonies sprang up at different periods, and are to be traced to different and opposite causes; as they pursued each a separate course before they were united or independent, and as they all submitted, more or less, to the control of Great Britain, it is quite obvious that history can disclose but little unity in party movements, where no issues were made on national topics as such,—no policy declared in which all could have an interest, or upon which all could have a right to exert an influence. But, as the colonists had some motives in common, as emigrants from the same country, a similarity of spirit will be found to have influenced them when called upon to act under similar circumstances, and in view of like interests.

In England, the Democrats were opposed and almost paralyzed by a powerful party. In removing to America, they were freed from that atmosphere of oppression which had surrounded them. There, they had endeavored to live in the full enjoyment of institutions which belonged to them in common with all British subjects. Here, they began with purposes which, though they were not defined with distinct particularity in their own minds, yet evinced an evident and determined disposition to favor republican principles, and to organize a Democratic party. In tracing such a result to its original sources, it will be proper to notice the acts and discussions which gradually gained concessions from the crown, and nationalized the colonists. That the colonists had distinct motives in respect to their natural rights, and to the formation of a government in harmony with their views, and such as would efficiently advance and protect them, is unquestionably true. Not that ministers had motives to such an end,—for, although it may be admitted that they were occasionally influenced by a benevolence of feeling, and made concessions which they deemed merely parental, there is no evidence that they favored republican tendencies, or the interests of America, beyond the narrow limits of the crown. If England were just, it was expected that America would be generous; if England were liberal, what could America do less than to be magnanimous?

The events and circumstances which immediately favored the Puritans have been considered. These were for a time of a limited nature, connected with character, locality and society. They constituted the beginning of a new community in a new country. The succeeding process was the formation of colonial interests in more extended relations. These were mediately

affected by events of a national tendency, and which favored every possible variety of exercise and development.

The great diversity of motive and character of the emigrants ; the various and distracted counsels by which the different companies were governed, and their detached operations in respect to the sources of power ; the troubles of Ireland and Scotland ; the numerous impeachments and contests of Parliament ; the tyranny and caprices of royalty ; the revolutions of Cromwell and James the Second ; the wars of Great Britain against Spain, Holland and France,—the peace of Utrecht ;¹ the solemn perturbations of the church and state ; “ new lights,” and new plans of colonial governments ; the eloquence and sway of master-minds of the seventeenth century, led by the lofty spirit of Chatham, were events and influences which contributed powerfully to the increasing ability of the American colonies, and tended to open to the vision of the gifted statesman new and extended views of national polity.

These, and similar events, extending through a long period of time, though foreign and external in their origin and direction, were prolific in positions of activity, and gave to the colonists opportunities for the exercise of mind in reference to public affairs, which were quite important, when considered in connection with their condition and future wants. They had a foreign policy to study, without its usual responsibilities. They were observers of troubles, foreign to their own, without being the subjects of them. They had constant accessions of men of character, thrown off by the convulsions of Europe, whose energies added spirit and vigor to the public mind. They could look upon revolutions with all the loyalty of subjects, and experience the elations of joy incident to success, and not leave their fire-sides, nor suffer the painful transitions from realities to the emotions of hope and fear. They could look upon the results of wisdom detached from the follies of failure, and calmly admire the dignity of character, exempted from the prejudices which surrounded and helped to produce it.

But this position of a passive nature was not of long duration ; for, when the interests² of the colonies were increased, and attracted the notice and

¹“The treaty of peace concluded at Utrecht,” says Bancroft, “was momentous in its character and consequences. It closed the series of universal wars for the balance of power, and, establishing the territorial relations of the states adjoining France on a basis which endures even now, left no opportunity for future wars, except for commerce or opinion.”—Vol. III, p. 226.

²“An order was issued, in October, 1621, commanding ‘that no tobacco, or other productions of the colonies, shall thenceforth be carried into foreign parts till they are

first landed in England, and the custom paid ;’ the Privy Council assigning these remarkable reasons : ‘That the king, weighing the great advantage which this crown and state might receive from a well-ordered plantation in Virginia, granted several immunities to the colonies, as not doubting but that they would apply themselves to such courses as might most firmly incorporate that plantation into his commonwealth ; that to suffer, therefore, a foreign trade, is as inconsistent with the view in the planting of Virginia as with just policy or the honor of the state.’

consideration of the king and council, or the Parliament,¹ they found themselves within the circle of national control, and both the subjects and representatives of principle.² The formation of private and public opinion led to formal declarations of motive in respect to the best organization of society; and questions arose in all those minor details which are usually to be seen in the affairs of practical life. The exercise of the prerogatives of royalty were watched in the wilderness, and the measures of Parliament were discussed in the rude domicile of the farmer and mechanic.³ Toleration was condemned by rival bigots, and Episcopacy was discovered and proscribed in its scattered

The deputy and council, offering some reasons to show the impropriety and hardship of this order, were told, in the stern language of those days, 'that they were not to dispute, but to obey.' Here, then, were, for the first time, disclosed all those principles of policy, with regard to the colonial trade, which were carried into execution, by an act of the legislature, at a subsequent day."—*Chalmers' Annals*, p. 53.

¹ The king invested the general superintendence of the colonies in a council, in England, "composed of a few persons of consideration and talents."—*Chalmers*, p. 15.

² The King of England, "informed of great distraction and disorder in the plantations of New England," referred the subject to the consideration of his Privy Council. This was in 1632. The council, after examination, passed a resolution, that the appearances were so fair, and hopes so great, that the country would prove beneficial to the kingdom, and profitable to the settlers, as that the adventurers "had cause to go on cheerfully with their undertakings," with an assurance that, if things were conducted according to the design of the patent, his Majesty would not only maintain the liberties and privileges heretofore granted, but supply anything further which might tend to the good government, prosperity and comfort, of his people in those plantations.—*Holmes' Annals*, vol. 1, p. 213.

In 1634, an Order in Council was passed, at London, requiring Mr. Cradock, a chief adventurer, then present before the board, "to cause the letters patents for New England to be brought to the board." A special

commission was given to the Archbishop of Canterbury and eleven other persons, for governing the American colonies. An order was also sent, by the king's commissioners, to the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, and other haven towns, to stop the promiscuous and disorderly departure out of the realm to America.

Under date of July, 1634, Governor Winthrop writes in his journal (137), "Mr. Cradock wrote to the governor and his assistants, and sent a copy of the councils, whereby we were required to send over our patent. Upon long consultation whether we should return answer or not, we agreed, and returned answer to Mr. Cradock, excusing that it could not be done but by a General Court, which was to be holden in September next."

January 19, 1635, the colony of Massachusetts prepared to counteract this order. The ministers, considered at the time as the fathers of the commonwealth, were consulted by the magistrates. At the request of the governor and assistants, all the ministers in the colony, excepting one, met at Boston, to consider two cases, one of which was, What we ought to do, if a general governor should be sent out of England? They unanimously agreed that, if such a governor were sent, the colony ought not to accept him, but to defend its lawful possessions, if able; "otherwise, to avoid or protract."

³ In the contest between the King and Parliament, in 1644, the colonies of New England took an early and sincere part on the side of Parliament. In 1644, the General Court passed an ordinance declaring

adherents. Titles were weighed, and nobility measured.¹ The earth was studied in regard to its probable uses, and lands were divided by theories representing the selfish, the benevolent, the speculative, the just and the unjust. The rivers and the seas were surveyed in reference to the fishermen of all nations, and the forests allotted to the furrier-huntsmen. The delicate subject of taxation was scanned in every variety of form natural to a hard-working people, jealous of their rights. Man looked upon man as his equal, and began to question the truth of the fearful assumption that petitions may be made to God, but not to Parliament. The right of petition was discussed and conceded. Men were counted as beings capable of speaking for themselves: and the representative principle became the subject of study and application.² Martial law was pronounced of doubtful tendency,³ and the civil power was tested with a nice discrimination in respect to the extent of man's perversity, as compared with his love of right. The army, as a permanent establishment, was viewed with fearful distrust,⁴ and the militia system

"that what person soever shall, by word, writing or action, endeavor to disturb our peace, directly or indirectly, by drawing a party under pretence that he is for the King of England, and such as join with him against the Parliament, shall be accounted as an offender of a high nature against this commonwealth, and to be proceeded with, either capitally or otherwise, according to the quality and degree of his offence; provided always that this shall not be extended against any merchant, strangers and shipmen, that come hither merely for trade or merchandise, albeit they should come from any of those parts that are in the hands of the king, and such as adhere to him against the Parliament; carrying themselves here quietly, and free from railing, or nourishing any faction, mutiny or sedition, among us, as aforesaid."—*Marshall*, p. 117.

¹ In 1636, "several of the English peers," says Bancroft, "especially Lord Say and Seal,—a Presbyterian, a friend to the Puritans, yet with but dim perceptions of the true nature of civil liberty,—and Lord Brooke,—a man of charity and meekness, an early friend to tolerance,—had begun to inquire into the character of the rising institutions, and to negotiate for such changes as would offer them inducements for removing to America. They demanded a division of the General Court into two branches,

that of assistants and of representatives,—a change which was acceptable to the people, and which, from domestic reasons, was ultimately adopted; but they further required an acknowledgement of their own hereditary right to a seat in the upper house. The fathers of Massachusetts were disposed to conciliate these powerful friends. They promised them the honors of magistracy: but, as for the establishment of hereditary dignity, they answered, by the hand of Cotton, 'Where God blesseth any branch of any noble or generous family with a spirit and gifts fit for government, it would be a taking of God's name in vain to put such a talent under a bushel, and a sin against the honor of magistracy to neglect such in our public elections. But if God should not delight to furnish some of their posterity with gifts fit for magistracy, we should expose them rather to reproach and prejudice, and the commonwealth with them, than exalt them to honor, if we should call them forth, when God doth not, to public authority.' And thus the proposition for establishing hereditary nobility was defeated."—*VOL. I*, p. 384.

² The first representative assembly in America was in Virginia, in 1619. The second was in Massachusetts in 1634.

³ Reference is made to Virginia.

⁴ The danger and impolicy of a standing

excited the jealous to suspect a foreign policy of promotion ; and American officers felt that a colonel upon the continent was as good as a colonel beyond the Atlantic.¹ Monopolies were formed, based upon every interest that promised any reward ; and questions of experiment racked the ingenious, and deluded both the credulous and incredulous. Inter-colonial interests indicated division-lines of separate communities, and questions of regulation were topics of discussion in the different colonies, as balance of power became the absorbing problem of the nations of Europe.

Thus questions for consideration arose with every advance of interest in the colonies ; and, while every increase of property gave additional importance to the particular colony where it was improved, it developed a corresponding spirit and judgment in the people concerning its control. To individual interest was added the conventional ambition engendered by the rivalry of separate colonies ; and colonies began to define their relations of right as neighboring communities, and their positions of power as national sovereignties. General interests of the continent were early viewed as subjects in common to be adjusted, and union for coöperation was a form of action as natural as it proved to be efficient. The government of the mother country, looking upon colonial enterprise as national gain, and colonial power as an increase of national strength, sought to regulate the one, and to control the other, by orders in council, or by legislation. Paternal grants gave way to royal suspicion, and parliamentary encouragement to parliamentary restrictions.

In these various relations the colonies were placed,—each having its party divisions peculiar to its own condition, and all having a common interest in the subject of foreign control, upon which the people divided in respect to continental policy.

It has been seen that, at the time of the Revolution, most of the colonies were governed as royal provinces. Eight of the thirteen were of this class. Two only remained of the proprietary form, while three had continued under charters.

It is doubtful whether history affords more instructive examples to illustrate the various forms of development of Democratic principles than may be found in the settlement and progress of the American colonies.

army was early declared, in the debates of Parliament, by the Democracy of England.

¹ "In anticipation of approaching hostilities," (with the French, 1755) says Hildreth, "a general order gave to all officers commissioned by the king or the commander-in-chief precedence over such as had only colonial commissions,—an order which created great disgust, and occasioned much

trouble in America. New clauses introduced into the annual Mutiny Act subjected the colonial soldiers, when acting in conjunction with regular troops, to the rigid rules of the regular service, and required the Colonial Assemblies to provide quarters and certain enumerated supplies for the regular troops within their jurisdictions."—VOL. II, p. 448.

THE SOURCES OF CIVIL POWER.

All the sources of civil power are opened for inspection; the various motives which lead to party organization are made apparent; and moral and political seasons of seed-time and harvest are passed in review, discovering the true principles of action,—the unalterable conditions of truth.

It may be said, for purposes of historical convenience, that power springs from three sources. The first and highest is conscience, around which are to be found, as servants, all the sentiments and faculties of the human mind; the second is property, or the possession of means to control the agency of others; and the third is of a conventional nature, and rests upon traditionary privileges,—such as inhere in the idea of royalty.¹ It is with the possession of moral or traditionary power as it is with the possession of property,—it is prized to the extent of its ability to control; and, as traditionary power precedes conventional agreement, property is often made subservient to royalty. Sometimes royalty bends its neck to be loaded with a golden yoke, and the two powers unite both as rivals and allies.

As but few men can be rich and independent of labor, it follows that most men are comparatively poor, and subject to the primeval conditions imposed upon Adam. As but few men can be rulers, or the dictators of

¹ M. Guizot indulges in some ingenious speculations with respect to the nature of royalty. He says: "Whenever society advances towards its modern and definitive character, royalty seems to extend and prosper; so that when the work is consummated,—when there is no longer any, or scarcely any other important or decisive influence in the great states of Europe than that of the government and the public,—royalty is the government."—*Hist. Civ. of Europe*, Vol. I, p. 162. He says, too, "It is evident that royalty has played a prodigious part in the history of European civilization," &c. One would suppose that Guizot referred to a principle which could be defined with some distinctness. Not so. For he enumerates several different kinds of royalty, and the reader is at a loss to gather an exact idea of his meaning. The fact that a man is made *king*, or emperor, shows simply that he is chief ruler, either by consent, or by the aid of force; but it does not explain upon what principle, or upon what conditions, he has been made so. The same may be said of the president of a republic.

The distinction between a *hereditary* and an *elective* chief magistrate does not relieve the difficulty; it only speaks of a fact that precedes the result, and the result remains still to be explained. Royalty simply refers to a form of government, without any reference to the principles upon which it is based, or to the limits of their exercise. If hereditary, it may be termed an idea of *necessity*, incident to a state of ignorance, or to an imperfect state of society, where judgment is content with traditionary authority. If *elective*, the result is either a free republic,—this form best representing the voice of the people,—or a monarchy, or an empire, with the promise of a constitutional government which concedes freedom to the subject, and thus secures his vote. When the people know enough, and society is properly organized in reference to the representative principle, royalty can have no existence. Hence its existence is merely incidental,—a result, it may be, of the exercise of sound principles, or the result of the entire want of principle.

society, it follows that most men stand in the relations of subject or citizen. As the dispensers of royalty and property are naturally inclined and impelled to be selfish and conservative, their systems of operation are found to be generally narrow and partial,—their concessions of right, slight and reluctant. In relation to these two classes, either singly or combined, the people are placed, as subjects, constituents, or debtors. That the people, who embody and develop the great principle of Democracy, constitute the real sovereignty of a state, may be regarded quite obvious, from the fact that, without them, royalty is but a name, and property a solecism. To speak of a king without subjects, of a Cræsus without a market, or of a market without a people, would be to ridicule the objects of language; and yet these terms indicate the great sources of power. Without industry, and the wants of men, wealth is nothing. Without the institutions of government to regulate the rights of men, royalty is nothing. With Democratic institutions, man is everything, and nominal distinctions yield to the dignity of character. Royalty, existing as the absolute disposer of human rights, is a tyranny. Wealth concentrated in the hands of the few, is a monopoly. If these conditions concur and unite in the same nation, the people are liable to be made both slaves and beggars. The transition of power from these uncertain sources, controlled by the few, and its diffusion among the people,—the rightful heirs,—is human progress. This is accomplished by Democracy, which continually claims a greater freedom, a more permanent industry, a wider range for commerce. It is the spirit of the people, asserting their wants, their interests, their rights and their privileges.

That the fluctuations of party must be continual and various, will appear when we consider the relative condition of these sources of power, to which allusion has already been made. Under a monarchical government there are usually three parties of interest: the king and nobility, and all those who are satisfied to be their mere dependents; the rich, who control the available wealth of the country; and the people, of all professions, who have a commendable ambition to acquire the comforts of life, and to enjoy equal opportunities for advancement.

As royalty combines with the representatives of property, or of principle, so parties are formed for good, for pecuniary profit or monopoly. Sometimes the love of duty and the love of money unite in the same persons. In a constitutional government, like that of England, the conventional power is again divided and subdivided, combined and modified, in an infinite variety of ways. The King, the Lords, and the Parliament, have their struggles for prerogative, their conditions of strength and weakness, and their forced coalition necessities.

When the king and the titled gentry suppose that the power of wealth will be equal to their wants, they seek alliance with the holders of property against the people. In such cases there are exchanges of property for power

and privilege by agreement. When they see the sources of revenue in the industry and enterprise of the people, and discover the great truth that freedom from restraint in the legitimate pursuits of life adds to the public revenue, then royalty takes the laborer by the hand, and unites with the constituted agents of the people in justly regulating popular rights. Industry yields more, and money less. The rich sometimes worship at the shrine of popular will, when mind fails to honor the holder of gold, or when the integrity of all public men is doubted because a few men know themselves to be dishonest.

To all these sources of power, with their numerous combinations, may be traced the different governments of the American colonies, and the varying policy of the English monarchs and Parliaments in regard to them, during their entire period of settlement.

While the first successful settlements were made by the lovers of freedom for freedom's sake, most of the colonies originated in motives of gain or of speculation. It is an interesting fact, that, however men combine to secure a common end, provided that end be one of general interest, and of vital importance to society, they arrive, by degrees, at the same points of truth, though by different means, more or less rapidly, and from different positions. There seems to be—to borrow a term of physical science—a *moral* centre of gravity, where all truth tends, however and wherever it is first promulgated. The light of truth shines upon all impartially, like that of the polar star, which as safely guides the Feejee Islander in his canoe as the admiral of the royal navy in the broad Atlantic.

Political parties of the colonies were associations of men formed for specific purposes, and directed by the same dispositions of ambition, honor and interest, which actuate men at the present day.¹ Then, although the sources of power were the same, there was no permanent unity of purpose in party movements, or government policy, such as exists in nations. If people were cheered by successful results to-day, to-morrow might teem with the events of adversity, beyond the power of a prudential foresight to remedy. Subject to uncertain changes of princes, governors, proprietors and Parliaments, they could not well take part in the political divisions of England without opposing or neglecting the interests of the colonies; and to organize parties in America seemed like disloyalty to the British government. Still, with all these eccentricities in the orbits of political rule, Democracy held but one language, claimed but one condition, and served but one master. "God and Liberty" was inscribed upon its banner, and sanctified in the hearts of the people. The compact of

¹ The question of obedience was a question of liberty, and gave birth to the parties of prerogative and of freedom. Such is the origin of the parties which continued to divide Massachusetts till the establishment of actual independence.—*Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 75. The Democratic and Tory parties.

the Pilgrims became the political creed of the continent, and the Democratic Party was organized for its defence. To this was opposed a conservative party, combining the spirit of royalty with the cupidity of wealth. From this remark it is not to be inferred that the Democratic party was free from the perversities of human nature, or that it was favored by a total exemption from error. Nor is it to be inferred that royalty was without its benevolence, or government without its justice, or wealth without its munificence. No. These sources of power existed then as now, and always will continue to exist, in the providence of God, for the good of man. Reference is made to their nature, to their general tendencies, and to the surest means to direct and control them. The Democratic party sought constantly to lessen the power of the few, to be extended to the many. Colonial governments, based upon monied power, proved a failure. Proprietary governments surrendered to the crown, and demonstrated that schemes of interest succeed *only* as schemes of interest; that the private ends of particular persons, or companies, seldom harmonize to meet the public wants, or to promote the public good. To say the least, royalty was allied to a national system, and the colonies could be better protected as the parts of a nation than as mere corporations,—more bent upon increasing the means of a company than capacitated to advance the prosperity of a people.

But, to illustrate principles which have been stated in general terms, it may be well to glance at the origin of each particular colony, so that the colonies may be studied in classes, as they stood at the time of the Revolution, and in view of a common standard. To commence with the royal provinces, the first to be noticed is Virginia.

VIRGINIA.¹

The first settlers of this colony were adventurers,—a company of men influenced by various and opposite motives, and subjected to conditions of a

¹ The first permanent settlement made in America was Virginia, under a charter granted to Sir Thomas Gates and his associates, by James the First, in 1606. That charter granted territories, then commonly called Virginia, lying on the sea-coast between the thirty-fourth and forty-fifth degrees of north latitude, and the islands adjacent within one hundred miles, which were not belonging to or possessed by any Christian prince or people. The associates were divided into two companies, one of which was required to settle between the thirty-fourth and forty-first degrees of north latitude, called the South Colony, and the other between the thirty-eighth and forty-fifth degrees of north latitude, called the North Colony. They were not to settle within an hundred miles of one another. By degrees, the name of Virginia was confined to the South Colony. The North Colony assumed the name of Plymouth Company, from the residence of the original grantees; and New England was founded under their auspices. Each colony had exclusive propriety in all the territory

necessitous as well as of a humiliating nature.¹ Their voyage to this continent was one of discord; and though they viewed the new country with admiration, their settlement was made without proper judgment, and became the scene of disagreement, suffering and death.² Whether King James considered himself as the father or the husband³ of the colony, it is quite certain that he proved himself to be not only the king *in abstracto*, but failed to recognize in practice his own theory of a king *in concreto*.⁴ Pacific without

within fifty miles from the first seat of their plantation. A new charter was given to the settlers of Virginia in 1609, and a third in 1612. A representative government was established, and the first colonial assembly was convened at Jamestown, June 29, 1619. A written constitution was granted by the London proprietors to the colonists in 1621. In 1624 the charter was vacated by authority of the king, who took the colony into his own hands. A governor and council were appointed by the crown, but the assemblies continued. On the breaking out of Cromwell's war in England, the Virginians remained faithful to the king, and a fleet was sent by Parliament to subdue them. In 1652 the colonists were compelled to acknowledge the authority of the Parliament. On the restoration of Charles II., Virginia became again a royal colony, and so remained till the period of the American Revolution.

¹ "The original planters of that most ancient colony are said, by contemporary writers, to have been," says Chalmers, "poor gentlemen, tradesmen, serving-men, libertines, and such like,—ten times more fit to spoil a commonwealth than either to begin or maintain one."—*Political Annals*, p. 69.

The persons named in the charter of Virginia (1606) were Sir Thomas Gates, Sir George Somers, Richard Hakluyt, and Edward Maria Wingfield. For every sum of twelve pounds ten shillings the contributor was entitled to an hundred acres of land, and as much more when the first lot was cultivated. The company fitted out three vessels, under the command of Christopher Newport. In these vessels one hundred and five men embarked, destined to form the first colony in Virginia. Of this number,

forty-eight were "gentlemen," twelve laborers, four carpenters, and a few other mechanics. The rest were soldiers and servants. In reply to complaints of the company (in 1608), Sir Thomas Smith, the treasurer, wrote that it were better to send out thirty working-men than a thousand like the present colonists.—See *Hildreth's U. S.*, Vol. I, pp. 99, 108.

² The population in 1609 was near five hundred persons; which number, in the course of six months, was reduced, by idleness, vice and famine, to only sixty, of all ages and sexes.—See *Bancroft*, Vol. I, p. 139, and *Chalmers*. In 1611 the colony numbered seven hundred men. In 1619 there was an addition to the population of the colony of twelve hundred emigrants, among whom were ninety young women, who were disposed of, for the cost of their passage, as wives to the planters.

³ King James I., in his speech to his first Parliament (1603), speaking of the union of the different kingdoms of Great Britain, said: "What God hath conjoined then let no man separate. I am the husband, and the whole island is my lawful wife; I am the head, and it is my body: I am the shepherd, and it is my flock: I hope, therefore, no man will be so unreasonable as to think that I, that am a Christian king under the gospel, should be a polygamist, and husband to two wives: that I, being the head, should have a divided and monstrous body; or that, being the shepherd of so fair a flock (whose fold hath no wall to fence it but the four seas), should have my flock parted in two."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. I, p. 977.

⁴ "An abstract king," said King James, "had all power; but a concrete king was bound to observe the laws of the country which he governed."—*Works*, p. 533.

a knowledge of national rights ; indulging in a monarch's pride, without a corresponding sense of a monarch's dignity ; obstinate, without the capacity of an intelligent firmness ;—this royal law-giver, in his self-complacency, extended his paternal verbosity to the American continent. The emigrants left their native shores without a knowledge of the instructions by which their interests were to be regulated, and without a knowledge of the governors to whom these instructions had been committed.¹ His majesty placed his will under seal, to be made known only in the wilderness. Thus commenced “ the most ancient administration of Virginia,” a “ pure aristocracy.”

With such a master, no one need be in much doubt as to the probable character of the agents of his choice to execute his will. The only hope to be countenanced, in such a case, would be, that the king might occasionally mistake his man, and thus by accident serve his people. With such a beginning, it was obvious that success could only commence with failure.² Restrained by the paralyzing rule of martial law, and distracted by seditions incident to such a rule ; subjected to arbitrary and frequent changes, to the attacks of savages, and severed from ties and influences of a domestic nature,—the colonists experienced all the desolations of terror, famine and want. But with the increase of numbers,³ and by the accession of character and resulting causes, the colony recovered in some degree from the shocks of misfortune, and became impatient to enjoy once more the freedom of their native country. To meet this feeling, the governor, Sir George Yeardley, in 1619, called a General Assembly, composed of representatives from the different plantations of the colony, and permitted them to assume and exercise the high functions of legislation. This was the first legislative assembly in America.

But the want of success in enterprise lessened the spirit of concentration, and the colonists became divided on questions of political control. Unsuc-

¹ These instructions, and the names of those persons who were to compose the future government of Virginia, were sealed up in a tin box. It was ordered that this box should not be opened until after their arrival.

² During five years next after their landing, the colonists were ordered to trade jointly ; that the fruits of the general industry should be placed in a public magazine, whence every one should be supplied agreeably to the directions of the Council. But when men are not to profit they will labor little ; and when all are fed from a common granary, few will concern themselves how it is filled ;—and with this reasoning

the Virginian story exactly corresponds. The emigrants were too often in want of food, and all the energy of martial law became necessary to promote diligence and preserve peace. There appear to have been, moreover, two capital defects in the institution of the settlement. First, the colonists had neither women nor property—the two objects which the hearts of men desire the most : women to smooth the asperities of life, and property to interest and invigorate.—*Chalmers*, p. 88.

³ From 1629 to 1640, some of the Puritans from Plymouth and Massachusetts emigrated to Virginia.

cessful corporations ever disagree in regard to the true causes of failure,—and struggles for ascendancy are directed by professed determinations to arrive at success, either by a continuance of a policy already begun, or by the adoption of new and different measures as remedies for the evils of the past. The conservative party favored the prerogatives of the crown, as the chief source of power; while the people, looking to their own good, and the growth of the colony, as the chief objects of their associated endeavors and interests, favored industry in its legitimate relations, and property in its rightful hands.¹ As the decrees of the Privy Council in respect to Virginia were opposed by the Democrats in Parliament, it was natural that the colonists should take positions according to their judgment, their prejudices, or interests. Public meetings for business² afforded opportunities for exchanges of opinion, and the affairs of the colony were discussed with the utmost freedom. Such a freedom gave energy to the people, and added to the spirit of enterprise. But the party that relies upon management, and upon the exercise of arbitrary power, for its advancement, is never to be satisfied by the evidences of prosperity. To witness their reality, excites its grasping disposition to control results; to realize their absence, is to arouse its spirit of arrogance in assumptions of wisdom that concede nothing to the wisdom of others. The royalists cared for nothing but for place, and for selfish opportunities of gain. They influenced the king by exciting his jealousy, and insured his active coöperation by admissions which were gratifying to his vanity. He was induced to interfere with their elections, in the belief that his commands would be regarded as laws; to appoint commissioners to investigate causes of alleged grievances, which had been fabricated by reckless partisans;—in fact, without descending to fictitious details, he was made to believe that the dignity of the crown could only be secured by taking away rights which had been conceded, and by recovering a control which had been surrendered.

¹ (1624). "The governor shall not lay any taxes or impositions upon the colony, their lands or commodities, other way than by the authority of the General Assembly, to be levied and ymployed as the said Assembly shall appoynt."—See *Bancroft*, Vol. I, p. 190.

² "The meetings of the company," says Bancroft, "which now consisted of a thousand adventurers (1623), of whom a hundred or more usually appeared at the quarter courts, were the scenes for freedom of debate, where the patriots, who in Parliament advocated the cause of liberty, triumphantly opposed the decrees of the

Privy Council on subjects connected with the rights of Virginia. The unsuccessful party in the company naturally found an ally in the king,—it could hope for success only by establishing the supremacy of his prerogative; and the monarch, dissatisfied at having intrusted to others the control of the colony, now desired to recover the influence of which he was deprived by a charter of his own concession. Besides, he disliked the freedom of debate." "The Virginia courts," said Gondemar, the Spanish envoy, to King James, "are but a seminary to a seditious Parliament."—Vol. I, p. 186.

The royal assumptions of power were opposed with a becoming spirit of indignation by the people ; but they had no ability to succeed in such a contest, and the company was dissolved. Virginia ceased to be a proprietary government.¹ Although but little can be learned from the many events which transpired during so short a period, still, enough was seen to satisfy the honest that freedom was a condition of success. "The spirit of liberty had planted itself deeply among the Virginians ;"² and if they were not permitted even to favor its outward expansion, no earthly power could deprive them of its inward workings, and the consequent enlargements of mind.

To understand the political character of the colony, it is necessary to study the sources of its power, the character of its society, and the nature of its industry. It was viewed by the people and government of England as a plantation for raising tobacco.³ It was favored by government for the revenue which it yielded ; and all measures of control, proposed by the king or by the Parliament, were based upon pecuniary motives—either to increase the means of the crown, or to favor court favorites who were ready to cross the Atlantic for purposes of speculation. The industry of the people being confined to a single staple, and that staple being made the currency of the country, and subject to the control of factors who stood in the double relation of buyers and sellers, the colonists were reduced to a narrow scale of enterprise. They were neither permitted to originate nor continue any course of means necessary to the formation of society or to the establishment of a self-pro-

¹ The colonial government was modelled after that of the mother country ; the governor, council and burgesses, of Virginia corresponding, in their respective functions, to the king, lords and commons, of England. There were, however, the following diversities : during the first year of the colony, when it was under the government of the Virginia Company, the governor, council and burgesses, sat together in the same room, and formed a single body, called "The Grand Assembly." The same thing afterwards took place during the greater part of the time of the Commonwealth. The governor and council, too, in their judicial character, exercised original as well as appellate jurisdiction ; and appeals from their decision lay to the General Assembly. These appeals were abolished in 1683, by an exercise of the royal prerogative ; but the judicial functions of the governor and council, constituting the General Court, continued throughout the

regal government. The number of councillors was limited to sixteen, though their places were seldom all filled ; and they were selected by the crown from those of the inhabitants who were recommended by their wealth, station and loyalty. The House of Burgesses, in the year 1743, consisted of eighty members, to wit : seventy-six from thirty-eight counties, three from the towns of Williamsburgh, Jamestown, and Norfolk, and one from William and Mary College.—*Tucker's Jefferson*, Vol. I, p. 19.

² Bancroft's U. S., Vol. I, p. 90.

³ "The use of tobacco had been introduced into England by some of the first adventurers to America, twenty years before the settlement of Jamestown. The use of it rapidly extended in England, and the more rapidly, perhaps, from the endeavors made by the reigning monarch to prejudice his subjects against it. A demand for tobacco being thus created, and it being already a product of Virginia, the settlers

fecting prosperity. As government agents, the officers of the crown were but little more than directors of a corporation, directing their energies to promote a single object. They were rather speculators than citizens, rather servants than laborers. The colony was subjected not only to all the withering influences of a partial employment of the human faculties, but it was sustained by no community foreign to itself. Its activity was confined to a circle whose enlargement produced no change, and whose utmost extent reached no variety of motive, and promised no additional reward. Indeed, its increase of enterprise was more like that of machinery than of mind; and while many inhabitants were added for labor, but few were added for character. The more wealthy portion of the inhabitants who had the means to command the refinements and influences of education, and of society, became distinguished for their lofty spirit of personal independence, and unbounded hospitality.²

soon began to cultivate it for market; and, under the encouragement of the very high price it then bore, it so engrossed their attention to the neglect of their corn, that they sometimes suffered severely from scarcity. It long continued almost the sole article of export; and, both from its furnishing the means of remittance to England, and from the inadequate supply of the precious metals, which they felt in common with all young and growing communities, it became the general measure of value, and principal currency of the colony. The members of Assembly, the ministers of the established church, the clerks of courts, and sheriffs, were all paid in tobacco. The payment of the county and parish levies, and most of the public taxes, was made in the same commodity. But, as it fluctuated in price, rates were sometimes fixed by the colonial legislature, and sometimes left to the discretion of the county courts, by which the prices of pork, maize, wheat, and other articles of general consumption, might be paid in this local currency. The quantity of exported tobacco gradually increased with the growth of the colony, until in 1758 it reached seventy thousand hogsheads,* equal to seventy millions of pounds, since which time the product has somewhat diminished."

In speaking of Charles I. in connection with the colony of Virginia, Bancroft says, "Virginia was esteemed by the monarch as a country producing tobacco; its inhabitants were valued at court as planters, and prized according to the revenue derived from the staple of their industry."—*Hist. U. S.*, Vol. I, p. 194.

¹ "Whereas many ships, laden with tobacco and other merchandises, have thence carried the same directly to foreign countries, whereby his majesty loseth the duties thereupon due, there being nothing answered in Virginia, you shall be very careful that no vessel depart thence loaded with those commodities, before bond, with sufficient sureties, be taken to his majesty's use, to bring the same into his majesty's dominions, and to carry a lading from thence, that the staple of those commodities may be made here; whereby his majesty, after so great an expense to that plantation, and so many of his subjects transported thither may not be defrauded of what is justly due for customs on the goods. The bonds to be transmitted, that delinquents may be proceeded against." *Extract from Instructions to Sir Wm. Berkeley: Chalmers*, p. 181.

² "The inhabitants are very courteous to travellers, who need no other recommend-

*The hoghead, which has been a very varying quantity, from three hundred and fifty pounds to fifteen hundred pounds or more, then averaged one thousand pounds.

In a country where all the products of a beneficent God were springing forth in their luxuriant beauty and abundance; where nature favored the diversity of motive, action, industry and genius; where life seemed pregnant with causes to develop character, to establish the solid foundations and to cultivate the refinements of society,—from the rising to the setting of the sun, for many generations, the Virginians could look upon little except their gloomy tobacco fields, and think upon little except their foreign tobacco market.¹ Enterprise had no heart, happiness no sentiment, and character was made subservient to government. Home was divested of its atmosphere, and country of its responsible exercises. Population sought shelter as the woodman seeks his temporary hut in the receding forest; the soil was planted and abandoned, as if made for desolation; and society moved in fragments upon the face of the earth, planting and raising a solitary weed,—as if man were created for abuse, and nations had been appointed executors to such an end.² So entirely engrossed were the people of

ation than the being human creatures. A stranger has no more to do, but to inquire upon the road where any gentlemen or good housekeeper lives, and there he may depend upon being received with hospitality. This good-nature is so general among their people, that the gentry when they go abroad, order their principal servant to entertain all visitors with everything the plantation affords. And the poor planters, who have but one bed, will very often sit up, or lie upon a form or couch all night, to make room for a weary traveller to repose himself after his journey.”—*History and Present State of Virginia* (1705), p. 76.

¹ In a work entitled “The History and Present State of Virginia, &c.,” by “A Native Inhabitant of the Place,” published in London, 1705, the reader will find a variety of facts in respect to the productiveness of the country, and the great want of enterprise. He says, “All sorts of English grain thrive and increase there, and yet they don’t make a trade of any of them;” and thinks, “if it should please God to send them an unseasonable year, there would not be found in the country provision sufficient to support the people for three months extraordinary.” * * “The sheep increase well and bear good fleeces; but they generally are suffered to be torn off their backs by briars and bushes, instead of

being shorn, or else are left rotting upon the dung-hill with their skins.” Beeves might be raised “to great perfection,” “but there is not an hundred acres of marsh drained throughout the whole country.” “Hogs swarm like vermin, and are often counted as such, insomuch that when an inventory of any considerable man’s estate is taken by the executors, the hogs are left out.” After speaking of many other products neglected, and by official discouragements, he adds:

“Thus they depend altogether upon the liberality of nature, without endeavoring to improve its gifts by art or industry. They sponge upon the blessings of a warm sun and a fruitful soil, and almost grutch the pains of gathering in the bounties of the earth. I should be ashamed to publish this slothful indolence of my countryman, but that I hope it will rouse them out, of their lethargy, and excite them to make the most of all those happy advantages which nature has given them; and if it does this, I am sure they will have the goodness to forgive me.”

² As this plant requires land of the greatest fertility, and its finer sorts are produced only in virgin soil, which it soon exhausts, its culture has been steadily advancing westwardly, where fresh land is more abundant, leaving the eastern region

Virginia in a single occupation, that they failed to make a distinction between the desolations of famine and the superabundance of the harvest. A large crop was fatal to the price, and a small crop encouraged idleness.¹ They could neither eat nor wear tobacco. With tobacco they could neither build a house, nor replenish a pantry, grade a road, nor build a bridge. Exchange was a necessity. The foreign market was the director of their enterprise, the measure of their means, and the dispenser of their gains. Virginia was the plantation,—England the home and the storehouse of the planter. The inhabitants of the colony were not expected even to clothe themselves,² or to provide the ordinary comforts of life, except by aid of the mechanics and manufacturers of England; and all trade with foreigners was strictly forbidden. Under such circumstances, what could be expected either for man or for society? Where men scattered over a large extent of territory with entire reference to their peculiar business, there could be but few subdivisions of society, such as give birth to towns; and where a people transferred all the results of their labors to a foreign land, motives to establish institutions for progress could exist only in a very slight degree. Religion became a subject of conformity for convenience, and popular education was looked upon as a delusion.

The reign of Charles I. and the administration of Cromwell were marked by so many events of a distracting nature, that but little time or attention could be given to the colonies in a foreign land. So far as the colonies were connected with revenue, they were attentively considered; further than this, but little was done to add to their means or to encourage their spirit.³ Occasional letters of instruction were given, and proclamations made,—but these evinced rather a business policy than a national system. To this exemption from foreign control Virginia was indebted for much of that independent spirit which was manifested in after times, and which led

it has impoverished to the production of Indian corn, wheat, and other grain. Its cultivation has thus generally ceased in the country below the falls of the great rivers; and, in its progress to the west, the centre of the tobacco region is now two hundred miles from the coast.”—*Tucker's Life of Jefferson*, Vol. I, p. 18.

¹ The “low price of tobacco,” says Bancroft (under the period of 1680), “left the planter without hope. The Assembly had attempted, by legislation, to call towns into being, and cherish manufactures. With little regard to colonial liberties, it also petitioned the king to prohibit by proclamation the planting of tobacco in the colonies for one year. The first measure could not

countervail the navigation acts; with regard to the second, riots were substituted for the royal proclamation, and mobs collected to cut up the fields of the tobacco-plants.”—Vol. II, p. 248.

² When the people of Virginia, after the colony had been settled for nearly a century, attempted to manufacture coarse fabrics suitable for clothing, Nicholson, the governor, advised that it should be forbidden by an act of Parliament.

³ Tobacco was heavily taxed in England, and, with a view to gain a revenue from the entire consumption, the people of England and Wales were forbidden to raise it, and, if they had any plants growing, to destroy them.

to those declarations of freedom which have so distinguished her sons. After the Restoration, 1660, the government of Virginia was more arbitrary, and more consistently conservative.

"The political sentiments of the planters," says Tucker,¹ "were manifested very differently in their relations with each other, and in the concerns of the whole province with the mother country. Whilst, in the latter relation, they, with few exceptions, showed themselves zealous assertors of their civil rights, in the colony itself there was exhibited a strong aristocratical spirit, which several circumstances had contributed to produce. The great number of indented servants, who for near a century constituted the largest portion of their agricultural labor, and who were subjected to a rigor of authority not known in England, had always divided the colonists into two distinct classes; and if many of the degraded caste, after their term of service was expired, had, by thrift and good management, acquired land, and even wealth, yet their former condition was not forgotten, and it was only in the second or third generation that the original line of distinction was effaced. The introduction of slaves tended to increase and confirm this inequality. The wealthy planter, living on a large estate, where he saw none but obliged guests or obsequious slaves,—commonly invested, moreover, with powers legislative judicial, or military, and sometimes with all united,—was likely to have a high sense of personal dignity and self-importance. Their form of civil polity, and the prevailing religion, endowed as it was with exclusive privileges, contributed, in some degree, to the same end. The aristocratic feeling, thus produced, variously manifested itself in the colonial laws. The whole public expenditure was defrayed by a *capitation tax*, levied on all males, bond or free, above sixteen years of age, and all female slaves above the same age,—by which every other difference in property, except as to slaves, was disregarded; and as to a part of the tax, the poorest man paid as much as the richest, since the expense of making and repairing the *public roads* was borne equally by all males over sixteen; the right of suffrage was limited to *freeholders*, except during a part of the time of the Commonwealth, and a few years afterwards; slaves were regarded as *real estate*, for the purpose of being annexed to the land, and of transmitting an undivided inheritance to the heir; and, lastly, in 1705, a law was passed to take away from the courts the power of defeating *entails*, as had been the practice in the colony, and was still permitted in England.

"The high wages of the members of Assembly may be regarded as a further evidence of the same aristocratic injustice. Their compensation, during the reign of Charles the First, was one hundred and fifty pounds of tobacco a day, besides the expense of horses and a servant, amounting to about one hundred pounds more. After allowing both for the lower money

price of tobacco at that period and the greater value of the precious metals, this daily compensation must be deemed equal to eight or ten dollars at the present time ; and as it was paid by the several counties to their respective members, we cannot wonder that it was one of the grounds of popular complaint in the insurrection of 1676, under Nathaniel Bacon.¹ In 1677 this complaint seemed to the commissioners sent from England so well founded, that, on their recommendation, the wages of the members were greatly reduced.

“Persons thus clothed with power and authority, and accustomed to its exercise, were not likely to prove the most submissive of subjects ; and though there was probably always a court and a country party in Virginia, as well as in England, yet by far the larger part of aristocracy of the colony sided with the whigs in all the disputes with the crown, or its colonial representative, the governor. Indeed, the spirit of resistance to illegal or oppressive exertions of the royal prerogative seems never to have been long dormant, from the year 1624, when Virginia ceased to be a proprietary government, until the period of separation.

“The annals of the colony, meagre as they unfortunately are, afford abundant evidences of this firm and independent spirit. Thus, in 1631, the Council and the House of Burgesses united in the bold step of sending the governor, Sir Matthew Harvey, a prisoner to England, to be tried for the tyrannical acts of his administration. In 1657, when the colony, which had espoused the royal cause, capitulated to the force sent out by Cromwell, his commissioners expressly stipulated with the House of Burgesses that the people of Virginia ‘should have and enjoy such freedom and privileges as belong to a freeborn people of England ; that trade should also be as free in Virginia as in England ; and that no tax, custom or imposition, should be laid in Virginia, nor forts nor castles erected therein, without the consent of the Grand Assembly.’

¹ Although the immediate cause of the people's taking up arms, in that civil commotion, was to defend themselves against the Indians, who were then ravaging the frontier, and who found impunity in the tardy and indecisive measures of an aged governor, yet after they had taken the means of redress into their own hands, and returned from their expedition against the Indians, other causes of popular discontent in the laws themselves were the subject of loud complaint, and became the reason or afforded a pretext for Bacon to keep his force embodied, and finally to assume the attitude of open war. One of the grievances complained of was, that all the revenue was raised by a poll tax, by which the wealthy landholder contributed nothing, except so far as he was an owner of slaves. This injustice was the more felt on account of the recent increase of taxes for the purpose of purchasing up the improvident grant made by Charles the Second to two court favorites. They also complained of the high wages of the members of Assembly, and the high fees of other public officers,—all indicating that the power of the government was exercised for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many.

"In 1673, Charles the Second having granted the whole province of Virginia to the Lords Culpepper and Arlington for thirty-one years, with the power to grant waste lands, receive quit-rents, form new counties, erect courts, and exercise similar acts of sovereignty, the colonists took alarm, and employed agents in England to apply to the crown, first for leave to purchase up this grant, and then for a new charter, which would secure the colony not only from a repetition of similar grants, but from other invasions of their rights. The application to the king's privy council by the colony's agents set forth ten provisions, which they asked that their new charter should contain; one of which was, 'that no tax or imposition should be laid on the people of Virginia but by the Grand Assembly.' After the negotiation of more than a year, the king, in conformity with the recommendation of his council, consented to all the requests, and directed a charter to be prepared accordingly. But either before the charter was executed, or, as some say, after execution, but before delivery, the news of Bacon's rebellion caused it to be stopped, and another substituted, in which, to the great disappointment of the colonists, the most important provisions, including the one respecting taxation, were omitted.

"In 1677, the House of Burgesses made a spirited opposition to an invasion of their privileges by the agents of the crown. The commissioners who had been sent out from England to investigate the circumstances of Bacon's rebellion, and who had been invested with a general power of sending for persons and papers, had demanded the journals of the house. This demand the Burgesses peremptorily refused; and their clerk being afterwards compelled by the commissioners to surrender them, the house, at its next session, after reciting this 'act of illegal violence,' declared their belief that 'his majesty would not grant' this power to the commissioner, for they 'find not the same to have been practised by any of the Kings of England;' they did, therefore, 'take the same to be a violation of their privileges.' They asked, moreover, for satisfactory assurances that 'no such violation of their privileges should be offered for the future.'

"This declaration of the Assembly, Charles, in his instructions to Lord Culpepper, the Governor of Virginia, stigmatizes as 'seditious,' and requires him to have erased from their proceedings.

"From this time until the Revolution of 1688, the Governor of Virginia and the Assembly seem to have been in a state of continual collision. The popular and the government parties were more distinctly marked, and in a higher state of irritation against each other, than at any previous period; occasioned partly by the mutual injuries inflicted during Bacon's insurrection, and yet more by the vindictive course of the governor and the royalists which succeeded it, and partly from the more liberal notions of popular rights and constitutional law, which the progress of knowledge, and the discussions provoked by the arbitrary measures of the house of Stuart, had produced in every part of the British dominions.

"In the year 1685 these bickerings rose to their greatest height. The Governor of Virginia, Lord Howard, had, by proclamation, declared, that since an act of 1682, which repealed another act of 1680, had not received the royal assent, the act supposed to be repealed was still in force. The House of Burgesses, conceiving that the power now asserted might, by suspending the exercise of the royal negative on the colonial laws, be used to revive laws that had been long disused, and which every one supposed to have been repealed, made such a spirited remonstrance against this and other offensive acts of the government, that the governor prorogued the Assembly.

"The reigning monarch, James the Second, in a letter to Lord Howard, passes a harsh censure on these 'irregular and tumultuous' proceedings of the house, the members of which, for thus presuming to question the negative voice intrusted to the governor, he does not hesitate to charge with 'disaffected and unquiet dispositions,' and with purposely protracting their time on account of their wages; and he therefore directs the governor to dissolve the Assembly. As the high wages of the members had long been a subject of complaint, the governor condescended to touch this popular string, by directing the king's letter 'to be publicly read in every county court, that the inhabitants and Burgesses may be made sensible how displeasing such obstinate proceedings were to his majesty.'

"This disagreement continued until 1689, when, on the accession of William and Mary, the liberal principles of the revolution prevailed, and produced a more conciliatory course towards the colonies. From this time until 1764, when the stamp act was proposed, there was no collision between either the crown or its representative and the Assembly of sufficient importance to attract the notice of historians, except the illegal fee for patents claimed by Governor Dinwiddie, in 1754. This the Assembly voted 'illegal and oppressive.' They even sent an agent to England expressly to procure its repeal."

During the whole period of her colonial existence, the affairs of government were designedly shaped to no instructive end. But in this colony the perversity of man had become a lesson of wisdom, and royalty was permitted fully to demonstrate its own pitiful nature. Democracy so commended itself to the intelligent aristocracy of Virginia that they embraced its principles, and the errors of monarchy served to illustrate its great and permanent truths. The great statesmen of Virginia were the pupils both of experience and philosophy.

SOUTH CAROLINA.¹

The settlement of South Carolina, although commenced with the avowed purposes of extending the gospel to the heathen, was conducted with a liberal

¹ The first attempt at settlement in South Carolina we have any account of was by some colonists from Virginia, in 1660, who landed on Port Royal Island; but they soon

spirit and an active eye to business. Men of every nation, sect and profession; of every class and condition; the unfortunate, the indigent, and the outlaw,—were invited with earnest encouragements, and influenced by substantial inducements, to emigrate to this favored territory. The soil and climate were represented as favorable to all the objects of industry; the bounty offered by the proprietors to emigrants was an important consideration to the poor and oppressed of foreign nations,—and the population of Carolina rapidly increased. Here met the Cavalier and Puritan, with repressed recollections; the English and the French, still swayed by national antipathies. Men of sober and severe habits of mind and body were joined by the thoughtless, who had been more accustomed to observe the requisitions of fashion than of principle; and the man who counted labor as a blessing, however well supplied with the comforts of life, had for his companions those who, however destitute, had always viewed it as a curse. Here were represented the industry and the frugality of Holland, the cheerfulness of Ireland, the firmness of England, the intelligence of Scotland, and the endurance of Switzerland; citizens, with reasonable motives to enterprise; speculators, with extravagant hopes and reckless purposes; and exiles, sobered by misfortunes and paralyzed by oppression.¹ With such a population in the beginning,—with a government marked out by one of the

abandoned the enterprise. Ten years after (1670) a few emigrants from England, under Colonel William Sayle, landed at the same place, and commenced a settlement; but, for some cause or other, they continued here only a few months, and then removed eastwardly, and permanently located themselves on the banks of Ashley river, above Wappo creek. Here on the first high land, they laid the foundation of a town, which, in honor of their king, they named Charleston. Two years afterwards the settlers found it expedient to remove to the opposite side of Ashley river, where the present city of Charleston was founded (1672). Upon the restoration of Charles II., this country (Carolina) was granted by him, in the year 1663, to Edward, Earl of Clarendon, and others, with extraordinary privileges, as in 1665 this charter was enlarged. It was divided in North and South Carolina in 1729.—*Mills' Statistics South Carolina.*

¹ "To increase population seemed to be a primary object," says Ramsay. "There is no evidence of any plan to procure set-

tlers of any uniform description, either as to politics or religion, further than that a decided preference was given to Protestants. The emigrants were a medley of different nations and principles." "From England the colony received both Roundheads and Cavaliers; the friends of the Parliament, and the adherents to the royal family. Young men reduced to misery by folly and excess; restless spirits, fond of roving; groups of settlers, from their attachment to particular leaders,—were to be found among the early settlers. In 1671, under the auspices of Sir John Yeamans, there was a small colony from Barbadoes; soon after, a valuable addition from the Dutch settlement of Nova-Belgia; in 1679 King Charles II. ordered two small vessels to be provided at his expense, to transport to Carolina several Protestants, who proposed to raise wine, oil, silk, &c.; in 1685 the revocation of the edict of Nantes contributed much to its population, and from these French emigrants have sprung families of the highest respectability. Besides the French refu-

greatest minds of the age, and administered by men of active habits and strong theoretic convictions,—it becomes a subject of deep interest to learn the results, as embodied in the character of the community, or to be found in its organization.

That the colony suffered from this diversity of condition and character is certain,—though it was in some considerable degree compensated by the activity to which it naturally led. It was rather the diversity of differences than the harmony of parts; the application of theory, without due regard to fundamental principles. Yet, while this diversity was unfavorable to the permanency of a proprietary government, it must be admitted that its tendencies to freedom were strong and direct. The doings of the government were closely observed by the various classes of people, and with varying motives. Such a government is too near the people to have the influence of royalty; too narrow in its policy to have the confidence of the Democracy. Proprietors cannot divest themselves of their private interests, and what may be proposed as a public measure, is examined as a private bargain. It is not in the nature of any man to be long an acceptable governor while his principles of government are made subordinate to pecuniary interests. The wants of men as citizens are of a much higher character than the wants of men as animals. When Locke,¹ therefore, framed a government of succession without a proper estimate of the chances of change against the chances in favor

gees who came directly from France, there was a considerable number which, after a short residence in the northern countries of Europe and of America, particularly from New York, repaired to this colony. In 1696 a Congregational church from Dorchester, Mass., with their minister, Rev. Jos. Lord, settled in a body near the head of Ashley river. From 1730 to 1750 great additions were made to the population. Contracts were made, bounties offered, free lands assigned, and other inducements held out to allure settlers from all nations. They came from England, Scotland, Ireland, Switzerland, Holland and Germany. Numbers of Palatines arrived every year. In 1755 there was a large number of exiles from Nova Scotia. The insecurity of life, liberty and property, in revolutionary France, and the indiscriminate massacre of Frenchmen in St. Domingo, drove several hundreds, near the close of the eighteenth century, to the shores of Carolina."

¹ The proprietors, anxious to improve their property, with the aid of the celebra-

ted John Locke, framed a constitution and laws for the government of their colony. These were in substance as follows: "The eldest of the eight proprietors was always to be the palatine, and at his decease was to be succeeded by the eldest of the seven survivors. This palatine was to sit as president of the palatine's court, of which he and three more of the proprietors made a quorum, and had the management and execution of the powers of their charter. This court was to stand in room of the king, and give their assent or dissent to all laws made by the legislature of the colony. The palatine was to have power to nominate and appoint the governor, who, after obtaining the royal approbation, became his representative in Carolina. Each of the seven proprietors was to have the privilege of appointing a deputy to sit as his representative in Parliament, and to act agreeably to his instructions. Besides a governor, two other branches, somewhat similar to the old Saxon constitution, were to be established; an upper and lower house of assembly:

of character ; when he adopted the assumption that a proprietary interest could be a permanent basis of government, even when subjected to the dictation of an uncertain Parliament, or a capricious king,—he certainly omitted to exercise his usual powers of discrimination, and failed to avail himself of that variety of knowledge in regard to man and nature for which he was so distinguished.¹ The want of a proper application of principles to a condition of things as they exist ; the absence of a disposition in the rulers to recognize the peculiar wants and wishes of the people to be governed,—are errors which never fail to produce consequences alike fatal to the peace and prosperity of society. As pride is a natural element in the character of man, self-respect is a sentiment which should be looked for in the people. To attempt to crush, or to abase it, is to degrade men, without any certainty of control, even if successful ; while to develop and direct so elevating a sentiment, not only exalts the common standard of dignity, but leads to corresponding developments of mind, which demand action and application.

The people of Carolina appeared well to understand their own business

which three branches were to be called a parliament, and to constitute the legislature of the country. The parliament was to be chosen every two years. No act of the legislature was to have any force unless ratified in open parliament during the same session, and even then to continue no longer in force than the next biennial parliament, unless in the mean time it be ratified by the hands and seals of the palatine and three proprietors. The upper house was to consist of seven deputies, seven of the oldest landgraves and cassiques, and seven chosen by the assembly. As in the other provinces, the lower house was to be composed of the representatives from the different counties and towns. Several officers were also to be appointed, such as an admiral, a secretary, a chief-justice, a surveyor, a treasurer, a marshal and register,—and, besides these, each county was to have a sheriff and four justices of the peace. Three classes of nobility were to be established, called barons, cassiques, and landgraves,—the first to possess twelve, the second twenty-four, and the third forty-eight thousand acres of land, and their possessions were to be inalienable. Military officers were also to be nominated ; and all inhabitants, from sixteen to sixty years

of age, as in the times of feudal government, when regularly summoned, were to appear under arms, and in time of war to take the field.

With respect to religion, three terms of communion were fixed. First, to believe that there is a God. Secondly, that he is to be worshipped. And, thirdly, that it is lawful, and the duty of every man, when called upon by those in authority, to bear witness to the truth. Without acknowledging which, no man was permitted to be a freeman, or to have any estate or habitation in Carolina. But persecution for observing different modes and ways of worship was expressly forbidden ; and every man was to be left full liberty of conscience, and might worship God in that manner which he thought most conformable to the divine will and revealed word.—See *Ramsay's S. C.*, Vol. I, p. 81.

¹ “Several of our American writers,” says Bancroft, “have attempted to exonerate Locke from his share in the work which they condemn ; but the constitutions, with the exception I have named, are in harmony with the principles of his philosophy, and with his theories on government.—Read *Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 144.

wants ; and when they saw in their rulers the spirit of injustice, and a policy characterized by all the elements of selfishness and iniquity, they lost all confidence in the integrity of property agents, and all respect for the motives of those who confessed themselves to be their followers. Alive to that independent spirit which is engendered by a companionship of men bringing together the sentimental nationalities of their various homes ; moved by interests which had been nursed into life by hardships, and fostered by sacrifices ; sustained by the tests of experience, and warned by examples of treachery,—they sought for relief in revolutionary measures without being false to the king, and expressed a greater confidence in a government that counted them as a part of a nation than in a government that would degrade the colony to the narrow limits of a corporation.¹

¹ The most numerous party in the country were dissenters from the established church of England. The Cavaliers were highly favored by the proprietors, and were generally preferred to offices of trust. The Puritans, on the other hand, viewed them with great jealousy. Several of the first emigrants, unaccustomed to rural labors and frugal simplicity, were pampered citizens, whose wants luxury had increased and rendered impatient of fatigue. By such the sober lives and rigid morals of the Puritans were made the objects of ridicule. The Puritans retaliated by opposing their influence among the people. The odious terms of distinction which had prevailed in the mother country were revived and propagated. The same scenes of debate and contention which had taken place in England, before and after the restoration of Charles II., were acted over again on the little theatre of Carolina,—but without bloodshed or legal prosecution. Disputes between the proprietors and settlers were of an early origin. The first contest was respecting advances for the encouragement of the settlers. The economy of the proprietors and the necessities of the settlers could not easily be compromised. The one thought that they had already done too much ; the other, that they had not received enough. To the latter, requesting a supply of cattle to be sent out to them, the proprietors replied, as a reason for their refusal, “that they wished not to encourage graziers, but planters.” It is from this epoch that we may date the prosperity of Car-

olina ; because she was then taught the important lesson,—“That she must altogether depend on her own exertions.”

Two parties arose ; one in support of the prerogative and authority of the proprietors, the other in defence of the rights and liberties of the people. In this situation, no governor could long support his authority. From 1682 to 1686 there were no less than five governors. Rigorous measures led to riots, gentle means to contempt. Resort to martial law exasperated the people to such a degree against the governor, that, in 1690, at a meeting of the representatives, a bill was passed for disabling Landgrave James Colleton from holding any office or exercising any authority, civil or military, within the province. He was banished by the people. He was followed by a usurper who rendered himself infamous by acts of injustice,—publicly tried before the assembly, found guilty and banished from the country. The colony was agitated by various questions of right and interest till 1719, when a revolution took place which changed the proprietary to a regal system of government. The people accused the proprietors of being false to their own declarations, false to the great interests of religion, false to the demands of justice, false to the best interests of the colony and to the principles of freedom. They held a convention, appealed to the crown, invited the governor to leave or join them, and thus established a new government. Royalty unconsciously responded to the demands of Democracy.—See *Ramsay's Hist. S. C.*, vol. 1.

After South Carolina¹ had become a royal province, and the people had assimilated in tastes, habits and character, the government was conducted

¹ Carolina was divided into two colonies, North and South, in 1719. The first settlement in NORTH CAROLINA was at Cape Fear, by people from Massachusetts, in 1661. The most numerous settlers in the north-western part of Carolina were Protestants, chiefly Presbyterians, from the north of Ireland. Bethabara was first settled by a company of Moravians, in 1753. Their numbers increased, and Bethany was begun in 1759, three miles from Bethabara. In 1763 they had built a church, and settled a teacher. Upon the arrival of the first Moravian colony directly from Europe, they began to build Salem, which was intended for a manufacturing town. They were joined by companies from Massachusetts and Maryland. In 1749, Neal M'Neal arrived at Wilmington, with his family and near six hundred colonists, young and old, from the Highlands, Scotland. They settled chiefly in Cumberland county; but some of them settled in Anson, and others in Bladen. Another company of Highlanders arrived in 1754, and some afterwards. They came chiefly from Argyleshire; many of them from Ila or Jura.

North Carolina was "insulted and depressed," says Williamson, "by the weak or vicious administration of wicked judges and worthless governors." The laws that were made to support a religious establishment," says the same author, "retained their force; for they were supported by the spirit of party. Learning was neglected, because it was of no party." The government of this colony was convulsed at different periods by riots and insurrections, and all the miseries of misrule visited upon the people. The most arbitrary acts were resorted to by the government to defraud the people of their property, and to deprive them of their rights. The REGULATING insurrection (1772) had its origin in the abuse of power," says Williamson, "and the depravity of civil officers. The laws had not been respected by men whose duty it was to see them executed. Sheriffs who collected

the taxes, in many cases, were greatly in arrears; and the public accounts were in a state of shameful disorder. In that situation of public affairs, it was not difficult to persuade illiterate and ignorant men that taxes should not be paid which probably would never be converted to public use."

The terms of agreement adopted by the "REGULATORS" indicate integrity of purpose, if not judgment in respect to proper means for their accomplishment. They united for "regulating public grievances of power, in the following particulars; with others of the like nature that may occur. 1. That we will pay no more taxes until we are satisfied they are agreeable to law and applied to the purposes therein mentioned, unless we cannot help it, or are forced. 2. That we will pay no officer any more fees than the law allows, unless we are obliged to it; and then to show our dislike, and bear an open testimony against it." They then agree to hold meetings of conference, in order to consult their representatives on the amendment of such laws as may be found grievous or unnecessary; to choose more suitable men than they had done for burghesses and vestry-men; and to petition the houses of assembly, governor, council, king and parliament, &c., for redress of grievances, for the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights and privileges. They agreed to abide by the decisions of a majority of their number, and took oath of their solemn determination to be faithful to the end. And yet, Williamson says:

"The 'REGULATORS' in N. Carolina were universally royalists, commonly called tories, during the Revolutionary War. Many people of rank and fortune in the other colonies, who held public employments, or chanced to be otherwise connected with government, adhered to the royal cause; but in North Carolina we could hardly discover among the royalists a man who might be deemed respectable from his fortune, his learning or his influence in society; hardly a man who had ever sustained a commis-

with more extended views, and colonial interests were sustained as a part of public policy. These changes were followed by evidences of public and private prosperity, which, though limited, gave to the people a long period of content. The population of the colony increased, industry received its reward, and society its gratifications. But the heart of the colony was in England. South Carolina had not yet become the home of the people. It was only a country for a successful business ; and, while their trade was prosperous, the people gave but little attention to the current questions of government. They sent a large portion of their children to England and Scotland to be educated ; and, while they discovered a growing taste for the refinements of society, they were slow to mature for themselves the broad foundations of society itself. Still, their quiet enjoyment of rights,—where the discussion of rights was not made necessary for pecuniary protection ; their disposition to acquire knowledge under circumstances of exemption from the responsibilities of public duty, were sources of influence calculated to give freedom to mind, and the spirit of independence to man. Men, when permitted, unmolested, to study the events of history, and the blessings and honors of patriotism, are certain to be patriots when placed in power. This truth was confirmed by the spirited sons of South Carolina at the time of the Revolution. Their intelligence gave them an abiding confidence in Democracy.

NEW YORK.¹

New York was commenced with no higher purposes than those of business. The proprietors were conservative Dutchmen ; and, true to their proverbial

sion civil or military. The tories were a poor, ignorant race. A regiment of those people was commanded by a colonel who could not read. He was called Fanning the Unlearned. Their politics were founded on hatred of the people who had corrected them, not on principle.”—*Williamson's North Carolina*, vol. II, p. 164.

Perhaps if the historian had said that *their politics were founded on a spirit of general distrust* of those who had ruled over them, he would have done them more justice. The people of South Carolina had been relieved by royalty, although they saw no reason afterwards to be true to their protector. The people of North Carolina, it seems, proved true to the power in which they had most confidence ; but that power was unable to save them. It was not because they were opposed to popular rights that they favored royalty, but for the

opposite reason, that they believed that popular rights would be protected by royalty. North and South Carolina did not begin to prosper, says Chalmers, “until blessed with a simple form of government ; when the one acquired the manufacture of *naval stores*, the other the production of *rice and indigo*: which have made both, in modern times, populous, wealthy and great.”—*Annals*, p. 552.

¹ The North River was discovered by Henry Hudson, a commander in the Dutch service, 1609. It was named in honor of its discoverer. The Dutch sent out ships to trade with the natives in 1610. Argall, an English commander, captured, in 1613, a few humble dwellings which the Dutch had built on the island of Manhattan ; and this was the beginning of New York. In 1615 the Dutch settled Albany, which they called *Fort Orange*. The whole country claimed

reputation, they favored no theory but that which gave preëminence to capital, and unconditional servility to labor. *The Dutch West India Company*¹ by whose facilities the settlement was made, and by whose authority the colonists were directed, was an organization as destitute of political

by them in virtue of Hudson's discovery received the name of the New Netherlands. Manhattan Island was called *New Amsterdam*. In 1625 a settlement was commenced at Brooklyn, on Long Island. The Dutch claimed the whole country from Cape Cod to Cape Henlopen. It was claimed by the English on the plea of prior discovery by Cabot. In 1643 the Dutch became involved with the Indians, and in 1651 with the Swedes, who had settled on the Delaware. The Swedes were compelled to submit. In 1664 Charles II., as the English had never abandoned their claim to the country, made a grant of it to his brother, the Duke of York. The government of England was established over the whole colony in October, in 1664, without opposition, and its name was changed to *New York*. In a war between England and Holland, in 1673, the colony was reconquered by the Dutch, but was restored in the following year. In 1683 a colonial assembly established a constitution, which was styled a *charter of liberties*.

¹ The charter establishing the DUTCH WEST INDIA COMPANY bears date the 8d of June, 1621. It was modelled after that granted, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, to the celebrated East India Company.

"The central power of this vast association was divided among five branches, or chambers, established in the different cities of the Netherlands, the managers of which were styled Lords Directors. Of these, that of Amsterdam was the principal; and to this was entrusted the management of the affairs of New Netherland. The general supervision and government of the company were, however, lodged in a board, or assembly, of NINETEEN delegates, eight (increased, in 1629, to nine) of whom were from the chamber at Amsterdam, four from Zealand, two from Meuze, and one from each of the chambers at Friesland, the North Department, Groenèngen. The nine-

teenth was appointed by their High Mightinesses the States General.

"Apart from the exclusive trade of the coast of Africa, from the tropic of Cancer to the Cape of Good Hope, and of the coast of America, from the Straits of Magellan to the extreme north, this company was authorized to form alliances with the chiefs of the native Indian tribes, and obligated to advance the settlement of their possessions, encourage population, and do everything that might promote the interests of those fertile countries, and increase trade. To protect their commerce and dependencies, they were empowered to erect forts and fortifications; to administer justice and preserve order; maintain police, and exercise the government generally of their transmarine affairs; declare war and make peace, with the consent of the States General; and, with their approbation, appoint a governor, or director-general, and all other officers, civil, military, judicial and executive, who were bound to swear allegiance to their High Mightinesses, as well as to the company. The director-general and his council were invested with all powers, judicial, legislative and executive, subject, some supposed, to appeal to Holland; but the will of the company, expressed in their instructions, or declared in their marine or military ordinances, was to be the law in New Netherland, excepting in cases not especially provided for, when the Roman law, the imperial statutes of Charles V., the edicts, resolutions, and customs of Fatherland, were to be received as the paramount rule of action.

"The States General engaged, among other things, to secure to the company freedom of navigation and traffic within the prescribed limits, and to assist them with a million of guilders—equal to half a million of dollars; and in case peace should be disturbed, with sixteen vessels of war and four yachts, fully armed and equipped; the

character as its members were dead to the great objects of existence. The government of Holland was as parsimonious in the expenditure of its power as the Dutch were reluctant to part with their stivers. The promises of the one, which proposed nothing but opportunity, were made consistent by the other, which afforded no position above that of labor.¹ The nation, and its wealthy men, as monopolists, were in co-partnership. The nation granted no power that implied the risks of responsibility,—the monopolists promised nothing for character, that involved expense, beyond the lowest price and rudest condition. The avowed object of the colony was to extend the trade of the country that had given it so mean an existence. The people were counted as mere appurtenances to the corporation, and Democracy was but another word for imposition, and public sentiment a term of imbecility. Sovereignty became the travelling-guest of precarious fortune, and the rights of men were sold to the highest bidder. Religious opinions of all kinds were tolerated,—not from a sense of justice, but from a heartless indifference. Freedom of trade was forbidden. Everything for profit, nothing for principle, was their practical motto. Emigrants from all countries were invited to the colony, with every encouragement, apparently, that the persecuted would find peace, the unfortunate comfort, and the industrious wealth. The invitation was not without its effect, and it was accepted by many.² But they soon found themselves in one of Holland's work-shops, claimed as subjects of taxation, and assigned to posts of labor that increased the power of the monopoly, added to the hopes of the stock-holders in the Netherlands, and multiplied the restraints of government. With a single eye to the business of the company, working-men were preferred, as best able to serve the colony; and when they arrived they were permitted to elect between burthensome employments or pauperism,—between a subordinate station or oppression. The commands of the company were absolute. All emigrants were required to promise obedience, without reference to time or conditions. To prevent free discussion, town-meetings were forbidden; and the people were deliberately advised that their good consisted in believing that Holland was the world, and that the Dutch West India Company were its agents; that money was national glory, and that Holland was its ultimate depository. Industry was looked upon as so much labor done, with utter indifference as to the means, whether by man or horse; and education was prized just so far as it increased the productiveness of the laborer without

former to be at least three hundred, and and the latter of eighty tons burden. But these vessels were to be maintained at the expense of the company, which was to furnish, unconditionally, sixteen ships, and fourteen yachts, of like tonnage, for the defence of trade and purposes of war,

which, with all merchant vessels, were to be commanded by an admiral appointed and instructed by their High Mightinesses."—*O'Callaghan*, Vol. I, p. 90.

¹ See Charter to Dutch West India Company.

adding to his wages. New Netherland was valued for the products of its country, and its natural sources of wealth; and the people were regarded as workmen employed, but not as men entitled to the privileges of citizenship.

The reader will be at no loss what to anticipate from such a policy. The company could neither do justice to its own interests, nor protect the interests of others.¹ It was false to its masters, and oppressive to its servants.

It was a benevolent dispensation of Providence that such a specimen of selfishness was given to the continent. It will ever afford an instructive example, to be contrasted with experiments of a different and opposite character in the other colonies. It will serve to show how indifferent to the public good a corporation is apt to be, in its attempts to increase its wealth, though the people employed may suffer from all the degradations of poverty, ignorance and vice. It will tend to illustrate the truth, that money without character is but an insignificant power, when compared to character without money. The oppressions of the company soon began to produce their natural consequences. The people divided. The passively indifferent, such as had experienced none of the delights of freedom, received their wages with an unmeaning silence. Some, those who had been frequent victims of misfortune, and whose broken courage failed them, were pressed, with their dependents, into the void of pauperism. Others, still influenced by hope, and sustained by physical vigor, decided upon a change, and left for Maryland and Virginia. Others, still, with an abiding spirit of self-determination, remained, to insist, to agitate, and to conquer. Their remonstrances and declarations recite the grievances inflicted by tyranny, and the remedies to be found in Democracy.²

¹ New Netherland cost the company, as it appears from their books, over half a million of guilders (\$220,000), from the year 1626 to 1844 inclusive.—*O'Callaghan*, Vol. I, p. 350.

² In May, 1653, Captain John Underhill, who had been the leader of the Dutch forces in the Indian war, hoisted the British Parliament colors, and issued "an address to the Commonality of the Manhattans, on behalf of as many of the English and Dutch as were interested therein," declaratory of the motives "which impelled them to abjure the iniquitous government of Peter Stuyvesant over the inhabitants living and residing on Long Island in America, and maintaining the justice and lawfulness of defending themselves and their rights, in a manner becoming a free people, against the oppressive administration of the said

government." This paper was couched in these bold and unscrupulous terms:

"I. We have transported ourselves hither at our own cost; and many among us have purchased their lands from the Indians, the right owners thereof. But a great portion of the lands which we occupy being as yet unpaid for, the Indians come daily and complain that they have been deceived by the Dutch secretary, called Cornelis, whom they have characterized, even in the presence of Stuyvesant, as a rogue, a knave and a liar; asserting that he himself had put down their names in the book, and saying that this was not a just and lawful payment, but a pretence and fraud similar to that which occasioned the destruction of Thomas Hutchinson, Mr. Collins, and nine other persons.

"II. He hath unlawfully retained from several persons their lands, which they had

Men were bold, and parties violent.¹ Seeing the source of their difficulties, the people had confidence in their ability to remove them. They began to

purchased from the natives, and which were confirmed to them under the hand and seal of the previous governor.

"III. He hath unlawfully imposed taxes, contrary to the privileges of free men; namely, six stivers per acre, chimney-money and head-money; the tenth part of all our grain, flax, hemp and tobacco; the tenth part of butter and cheese from those who pasture cattle; excessive duties on exported goods—fifteen stivers for a beaver; all which taxes are to be paid by the poor farmer, to maintain a lazy horde of tyrants over innocent subjects.

"IV. He hath, in violation of liberty of conscience, and contrary to hand and seal, enforced articles (of belief) upon the people, ordering them otherwise, against the laws of God and man, to quit the country within two months.

"V. He hath imprisoned both English and Dutch, without trial setting them at liberty again, after a popish inquisition, to their great sorrow, damage and loss of time, himself not having any Patent from King James of England, the right grantor thereof.

"VI. He hath, also, imposed general laws forbidding the inhabitants to sell their goods, or to brew their grain, without the approbation of his government.

"VII. He hath neglected to avenge English and Dutch blood shed by the Indians since the peace.

"VIII. He hath treacherously and undoubtedly conspired, as proved, to murder all the English.

"IX. He hath been guilty of barbarous cruelty towards Mr. Jacob Wolfertsen and his wife, at the time of the birth of their child.

"X. He hath acted treacherously towards Thomas Newton; for, notwithstanding the government had promised him safe and secure conduct, he hath ordered his arrest and surrendered him.

"XI. He hath been guilty of the unheard-of act of striking with his cane an old gentle-

man, a member of his council, and hath publicly threatened every freeman who does not conform to his pleasure.

"XII. He hath, moreover, imposed magistrates on freemen without election and voting. This great autocracy and tyranny is too grievous for any brave Englishman and good Christian any longer to tolerate. In addition to all this, the Dutch have proclaimed war against every Englishman, living wherever he may wish or like.

"The above grounds are sufficient for all honest hearts, that seek the glory of God and their own peace and prosperity, to throw off this tyrannical yoke. Accept and submit ye, then, to the Parliament of England, and beware ye of becoming traitors to one another for the sake of your own quiet and welfare.

"Written by me, JOHN UNDERHILL."

Underhill was ordered to quit the province forthwith.—*O'Callaghan*, II, p. 224.

In December, 1653, the people called a convention to deliberate upon their rights and privileges, and demanded that no new laws should be enacted without their consent. Bancroft gives the substance of their remonstrance and petition, from the Dutch originals, drafted by George Baxter. They say: "The States General of the United Provinces are our liege lords; we submit to the laws of the United Provinces; and our rights and privileges ought to be in harmony with those of the Fatherland, for we are a member of the state, and not a subjugated people. We, who have come together from various parts of the world, and are a blended community of various lineage; we, who have, at our own expense, exchanged our native lands for the protection of the United Provinces; we, who have transformed the wilderness into fruitful farms,—demand that no new laws shall be enacted but with consent of the people, that none shall be appointed to office but with the approbation of the people, that obscure and obsolete laws shall never be revived."

Here is an example of Democracy from

¹ See note 1, next page.

realize a proper self-respect; to discover the responsible relations of industry as connected with mind; and to discern that, in addition to the duties of clothing and feeding their bodies, they had souls to exercise, characters to form, and a society to redeem and perpetuate. The sun of liberty was shining upon the continent; geographical lines could not intercept its light. It radiated from the south and from the north, and New Netherland could not long remain in darkness. Democracy had been planted there from New England; and the Puritan and Dutch Republican rejoiced together, recognizing the great truths that industry harmonized with moral duty, that wealth was nothing without character, and that duty and character could be nothing without freedom.²

But New Netherland had its root in Holland,—the other colonies, in

Holland (1658), and the Governor, STUYVESANT, fairly represented the opposite party. In his reply, he said: "Will you set your names to the visionary notions of the New England man? Is no one of the Netherlands' nation able to draft your petition? And your prayer is so extravagant,—you might as well claim to send delegates to the assembly of their High Mightinesses themselves!"

"Laws will be made by the Director and Council. Evil manners produce good laws for their restraint; and therefore the laws of New Netherlands are good."

"Shall the people elect their own officers?—If this rule become our cynosure, and the election of magistrates be left to the rabble, every man will vote for one of his own stamp. The thief will vote for a thief; the smuggler for a smuggler; and fraud and vice will become privileged."

"The old laws remain in force; directors will never make themselves responsible to subjects."—VOL II, p. 306.

O'Callaghan makes a slight exception to the translation of Bancroft. He says: "The Director-general does not call Baxter 'a New England man;' he calls him plainly an Englishman, as distinguishing him from a Dutchman, without any reference to New England."—*Hist. New Netherland*, VOL. II, p. 248.

¹ "Traitor," "villain," "liar," were epithets flung at the Director-general with unsparing hand; and, notwithstanding the banishments and heavy fines were imposed

on the libellers, many threatened him with rougher usage when he should "take off the coat with which he was decorated by the lords his masters."—*O'Callaghan*, I, p. 895.

² O'Callaghan thinks that Bancroft does injustice to the Dutch in supposing that they derived their ideas of "popular freedom" from the Puritans. He says: "For more than a century previous to the period of which we now write, three hundred manors in the province of Holland alone enjoyed all the rights of free municipalities, and exercised civil and criminal jurisdiction, to a limited extent. In removing to another hemisphere the Dutch lost not their affection for their native country and its institutions. They brought with them the names of those places to which they were most attached, and, in the course of time, transferred also to their new homes the municipal system which we have described above, and with which they were most conversant."

"Those colonists who shall form within their limits such a settlement of people as to constitute hamlets, villages, or even cities, shall obtain in such case middle and low jurisdiction, and the same rights as manors in the province of Holland; and shall, in like manner, be capacitated also to bear and use the names and titles thereof. And the qualified persons of such cities, villages and hamlets, shall, in such case, be authorized to nominate for the office of magistrates a double number of persons, wherefrom a selection shall seasonably be made by the Director and Council, the appointment of

England. Holland had reached its period of unity ; England had commenced its period of extension and diversity. Holland was conservative, England democratic. Holland was a trader ; England a missionary of truth. England enjoyed a unity in sovereignty, and represented a principle ; Holland based its sovereignty on property, and was content to receive an interest. Cromwell saw the discordant elements in the Dutch colony ; but it was left to be removed by Charles II., and in time to be governed both by a royalist and a papist.

The colony commenced with a gross abuse of a noble principle. The tyranny of wealth allows no grace. It appeals to the lowest motives, and extends but little favor to the generous affections or to the refinements of mind. Its attentions to society, as such, are but acts of condescension and complacency. The company soon saw that their plans were in no proportion to their wishes ; and, still having more confidence in property than in principle, they enlarged their errors, but failed to correct them.¹ Small proprietors, with their industry, had not succeeded ; it now remained to be seen what could be done by large proprietors, with their wealth. They conceded to

a schout, secretary, and court-messenger, remaining to the company ; with the understanding that the jurisdiction shall be holden in fief by the respective colonists and founders of cities and villages, to be disposed of and renewed, in case of the demise of those who shall be named, in manner hereinbefore stated. And justice shall be administered therein according to the style and order of the province of Holland, and the cities and manors thereof, to which end the courts there shall follow, as far as the same is possible, the ordinances received here in Amsterdam.

"It was, then, to that republican state—to the wise and beneficent modifications of the feudal code which obtained there, and not to 'the Puritan idea of popular freedom' introduced by emigrants from Connecticut, as some incorrectly claim—that New Netherland and the several towns within its confines were indebted for whatever municipal privileges they enjoyed. The charters under which they were planted, the immunities which they obtained, were essentially of Dutch, and not of Connecticut origin ; and those who look to New England as the source of popular privileges in New Netherland fall, therefore, into an error, sanc-

tioned neither by law nor by history."—VOL. I., p. 392.

With a little modification, both are right. O'Callaghan virtually admits the truth of Bancroft in giving the causes of the failure of the Dutch colony, and when he compares it with those of the English, and in assigning to the English so leading a part. Bancroft confirms the historical accuracy of O'Callaghan, when he says, "*British officials sent home complaints of 'the Dutch Republicans' as disloyal.*"—VOL. IV, p. 145. The Democrats of England were in advance of those of Holland ; but when they met in New Netherland they breathed the same atmosphere, loved the same soil, moved in the same light, honored the same principles, shared the same dangers, fought the same battles, and rejoiced in the same victories.

¹ Seven years had now nearly elapsed since the incorporation of the West India Company, and five since that body had been in active operation, yet nothing had been done to carry out that part of the charter which obliged them to advance settlements and encourage population in those fertile countries in North America committed to their charge. A few servants of the com-

an aristocracy what belonged to the people; and they soon found rivals in patroons,¹ who consented to agreements because these established them in power, and not because of any general good intended for society or for man. And thus, as will be seen in the charter,² were "transplanted to the free soil

pany, connected with the trading-posts which served as a rendezvous for the neighboring Indians, were the only inhabitants, it may be said, of the extensive country claimed as New Netherland. Not a particle of the soil was reclaimed, save what scantily supplied the wants of those attached to the three forts which were erected within the limits of this rich and vast territory; and the only exports were the spontaneous products of the forests. Experience had demonstrated, in the interim, that no benefits had accrued to the company from this plantation, under the present system of management, except what the peltries produced. The mode of life pursued by the people was very irregular, the expenses of the establishment excessively high, and the results not as flattering as anticipated. These considerations having been frequently brought before the XIX., it was finally determined that the resources of the country under their jurisdiction would be most efficiently developed by the planting of "colonies," or seignorial fiefs or manors, there.

A meeting of the Assembly of the XIX., accordingly took place early this year. It was attended by commissioners from their High Mightinesses the States General, and directors and assessors on the part of the principal partners; and a draft of a "charter of privileges and exemptions," which was considered alike serviceable to the company and advantageous to the patroons, masters, and private individuals, who should plant colonies in New Netherland under its provisions, having been submitted, was referred forthwith to a committee for examination, which was instructed to report to a future meeting.—*O'Callaghan*, Vol. I, p. 110.

¹ In 1652 it was said that "the patroons have become so daringly enterprising as not only to abuse their privileges, but to

presume to exclude the inhabitants of New Netherland from trading in their colonies, which is not only contrary to the law of nature, but opposed to the laws and customs of the land."—*O'Callaghan*, Vol. II, p. 189.

² Articles reported by a committee to the Assembly of XIX., who, on the seventh day of June, 1629, agreed to these important concessions, which were duly ratified by the States General, and published in the following terms:

"FREEDOMS AND EXEMPTIONS

GRANTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE XIX. OF THE PRIVILEGED WEST INDIA COMPANY, TO ALL SUCH AS SHALL PLANT ANY COLONIES IN NEW NETHERLAND:

"I. Such members of the said company as may be inclined to settle any colonie in New Netherland shall be permitted to send in the ships of this company going thither three or four persons to inspect the situation of the country, provided that they, with the officers and ship's company, swear to the articles, so far as they relate to them, and pay for provisions and for passage, going and coming, six stuyvers per diem; and such as desire to eat in the cabin, twelve stuyvers, and to be subordinate and give assistance like others, in cases offensive and defensive; and if any ships be taken from the enemy, they shall receive, pro rata, their proportions with the ship's company, each according to his quality; that is to say, the colonists eating out of the cabin shall be rated with the sailors, and those who eat in the cabin with those of the company's men who eat at table and receive the lowest wages.

"II. Though, in this respect, shall be preferred such persons as have first appeared and desired the same from the company.

"III. All such shall be acknowledged

of America," says O'Callaghan, "the feudal tenure and feudal burdens of continental Europe, a fact remarkable principally as a characteristic of the era

Patroons of New Netherland who shall, within the space of four years next after they have given notice to any of the Chambers of the Company here, or to the Commander or Council there, undertake to plant a colonie there of fifty souls, upwards of fifteen years old; one-fourth part within one year, and within three years after the sending of the first, making together four years, the remainder, to the full number of fifty persons, to be shipped from hence, on pain, in case of wilful neglect, of being deprived of the privileges obtained; but it is to be observed that the company reserve the island of the Manhattes to themselves.

"IV. They shall, from the time they make known the situation of the places where they propose to settle colonies, have the preference to all others of the absolute property of such lands as they have there chosen; but in case the situation should not afterwards please them, or that they should have been mistaken as to the quality of the land, they may, after remonstrating concerning the same to the Commander and Council there, be at liberty to choose another place.

"V. The Patroons, by virtue of their power, shall and may be permitted, at such places as they shall settle their colonies, to extend their limits four miles* along the shore, that is, on one side of a navigable river, or two miles† on each side of a river, and so far into the country as the situation of the occupiers will permit; provided and conditioned that the company keep to themselves the lands lying and remaining between the limits of colonies, to dispose thereof, when and at such time as they shall think proper, in such manner that no person shall be allowed to come within seven or eight miles‡ of them without their consent, unless the situation of the land thereabout were such that the Commander and Council, for good reasons, should order otherwise; always observing that the first

occupiers are not to be prejudiced in the right they had obtained, other than, unless the service of the Company should require it, for the building of fortifications, or something of that sort; remaining, moreover, the command of each bay, river, or island, of the first-settled colonie, under the supreme jurisdiction of their High Mightinesses the States General, and the company; but that, on the next colonies being settled on the same river or island, they may, in conjunction with the first, appoint one or more council, in order to consider what may be necessary for the prosperity of the colonies on the said river and island.

"VI. They shall forever possess and enjoy all the lands lying within the aforesaid limits, together with the fruits, rights, minerals, rivers and fountains thereof; as also the chief command and lower jurisdictions, fishing, fowling and grinding, to the exclusion of all others, to be holden from the company as a perpetual inheritance, without it ever devolving again to the company, and in case it should devolve, to be redeemed and repossessed with twenty guilders per colonie, to be paid to this company, at the chamber here, or to their commander there, within a year and six weeks after the same occurs, each at the chamber where he originally sailed from; and further, no person or persons whatsoever shall be privileged to fish and hunt but the Patroons and such as they shall permit; and in case any one should in time prosper so much as to found one or more cities, he shall have power and authority to establish officers and magistrates there, and to make use of the title of his colonie, according to his pleasure and to the quality of the persons.

"VII. There shall likewise be granted to all Patroons who shall desire the same, *venia testandi*, or liberty to dispose of their aforesaid heritage, by testament.

"VIII. The Patroons may, if they

*Equal to sixteen English miles.

†Or eight English miles.

‡Thirty-two English miles.

in which it was produced. It bears all the marks of the social system which prevailed at the time, not only among the Dutch, but among the other nations

think proper, make use of all lands, rivers and woods, lying contiguous to them, for and during so long a time as this company shall grant them to other patroons or particulars.

"IX. Those who shall send persons over to settle colonies shall furnish them with proper instructions, in order that they may be ruled and governed conformably to the rule of government made, or to be made, by the Assembly of the Nineteen, as well in the political as in the judicial government; which they shall be obliged first to lay before the directors of the respective colleges.

"X. The Patroons and Colonists shall be privileged to send their people and effects thither, in ships belonging to the company, provided they take the oath, and pay to the company for bringing over the people as mentioned in the first article: and for freight of the goods five per cent. ready money, to be reckoned on the prime cost of the goods here; in which is, however, not to be included such creatures and other implements as are necessary for the cultivation and improvement of the lands, which the company are to carry over without any reward, if there is room in their ships. But the Patroons shall, at their own expense, provide and make places for them, together with everything necessary for the support of the creatures.

"XI. In case it should not suit the company to send any ships, or in those going there should be no room; then the said Patroons, after having communicated their intentions, and after having obtained consent from the company in writing, may send their own ships or vessels thither: provided, that in going or coming they go not out of their ordinary course; giving security to the company for the same, and taking on board an assistant, to be victualled by the Patroons, and paid his monthly wages by the company; on pain, for doing the contrary, of forfeiting all the right and

property they have obtained to the colonie.

"XII. Inasmuch as it is intended to people the island of the Manhattes first, all fruits and wares that are produced on the lands situate on the North River, and lying thereabout, shall, for the present, be brought there before they may be sent elsewhere; excepting such as are from their nature unnecessary there, or such as cannot, without great loss to the owner thereof, be brought there; in which case the owners thereof shall be obliged to give timely notice in writing of the difficulty attending the same to the company here, or the commander and council there, that the same may be remedied as the necessity thereof shall be found to require.

"XIII. All the Patroons of colonies in New Netherland, and of colonies on the island of Manhattes, shall be at liberty to sail and traffic all along the coast from Florida to Terra Neuf, provided that they do again return with all such goods as they shall get in trade to the island of Manhattes, and pay five per cent. for recognition to the company, in order, if possible, that after the necessary inventory of the goods shipped be taken, the same may be sent hither. And if it should so happen that they could not return, by contrary streams or otherwise, they shall, in such case, not be permitted to bring such goods to any other place but to these dominions, in order that under the inspection of the directors of the place where they may arrive they may be unladen, an inventory thereof made, and the aforesaid recognition of five per cent. paid to the company here, on pain, if they do the contrary, of the forfeiture of their goods so trafficked for, or the real value thereof.

"XIV. In case the ships of the Patroons, in going to, or coming from, or sailing on the coast from Florida to Terra Neuf, and no further, without our grant, shall overpower any of the prizes of the enemy, they shall be obliged to bring, or

which had adopted the civil law. The 'colonies' were but transcripts of the 'lordships' and 'seigneuries' so common at this period, and which the

cause to be brought, such prize to the college of the place from whence they sailed out, in order to be rewarded by them; the company shall keep the one-third part thereof, and the remaining two-thirds shall belong to them, in consideration of the cost and risk they have been at, all according to the orders of the company.

"XV. It shall be also free for the aforesaid Patroons to traffic and trade all along the coast of New Netherland and places circumjacent, with such goods as are consumed there, and receive in return for them all sorts of merchandise that may be had there, except beavers, otters, minks, and all sorts of peltry, which trade the company reserve to themselves. But the same shall be permitted at such places where the company have no factories, conditioned that such traders shall be obliged to bring all the peltry they can procure to the island of Manhattes, in case it may be, at any rate, practicable, and there deliver to the Director, to be by him shipped hither with the ships and goods; or, if they should come here, without going there, then to give notice thereof to the company, that a proper account thereof may be taken, in order that they may pay to the company one guilder for each merchantable beaver and otter skin; the property, risk, and all other charges, remaining on account of the Patroons, or owners.

"XVI. All coarse wares that the colonists of the Patroons there shall consume, such as pitch, tar, wood-ashes, wood, grain, fish, salt, hearthstone, and such like things, shall be brought over in the company's ships, at the rate of eighteen guilders (\$7.20) per last; four thousand weight to be accounted a last, and the company's ship's crew shall be obliged to wheel and bring the salt on board, whereof ten lasts make a hundred. And in case of the want of ships, or room in the ships, they may order it over at their own cost, in ships of their own, and enjoy in these dominions such liberties and benefits as the company have granted;

but in either case they shall be obliged to pay, over and above the recognition of five per cent., eighteen guilders for each hundred of salt that is carried over in the company's ships.

"XVII. For all wares which are not mentioned in the foregoing article, and which are not carried by the last, there shall be paid one dollar for each hundred pounds weight; and for wines, brandies, verjuice and vinegar, there shall be paid eighteen guilders per cask.

"XVIII. The company promises the colonists of the Patroons that they shall be free from customs, taxes, excise, imposts, or any other contributions, for the space of ten years; and after the expiration of the said ten years, at the highest, such customs as the goods are taxable with here for the present.

"XIX. They will not take from the service of the Patroons any of their colonists, either man or woman, son or daughter, man-servant or maid-servant, and though any of them should desire the same, they will not receive them, much less permit them to leave their Patroons, and enter into the service of another, unless on consent obtained from their Patroons in writing; and this for and during so many years as they are bound to their Patroons; after the expiration whereof, it shall be in the power of the Patroons to send hither all such colonists as will not continue in their service, and until then shall not enjoy their liberty. And all such colonists as shall leave the service of his Patroon and enter into the service of another, or shall, contrary to his contract, leave his service; we promise to do everything in our power to apprehend and deliver the same into the hands of his Patroon, or attorney, that he may be proceeded against, according to the customs of this country, as occasion may require.

"XX. From all judgments given by the courts of the Patroons for upwards of fifty guilders (\$20) there may be an appeal to

French were establishing, contemporaneously, in their possessions north of New Netherland, where most of the feudal appendages of high and low jurisdiction, mutation fines, preëmption rights, exclusive monopolies of mines, minerals, water-courses, hunting, fishing, fowling, and grinding, which we find enumerated in the charter to patroons, form part of the civil law of the country at the present day. But, however favorable the feudal tenure may be to a young country, and to agriculturists of small capital, whose interest it might be to husband their scanty means, in order the quicker and more effectually to enable them to reclaim their wild land, it cannot be denied that the charter before us had many faults and many imperfections. 'While it secured the right of the Indian to the soil,' says Moulton, 'and enjoined schools and churches, it scattered the seeds of servitude, slavery and aristocracy. While it gave to freemen as much land as they could cultivate, and exempted colonists from taxation for ten years, it fettered agriculture by restricting commerce and prohibiting manufactures.'"

the company's commander and council in New Netherland.

"XXI. In regard to such private persons as on their own account, or others in the service of their masters here (not enjoying the same privileges as the Patroons), shall be inclined to go thither and settle; they shall, with the approbation of the Director and council there, be at liberty to take up as much land, and take possession thereof, as they shall be able properly to improve, and shall enjoy the same in full property either for themselves or masters.

"XXII. They shall have free liberty of hunting and fowling, as well by water as by land, generally, and in public and private woods and rivers, about their colonies, according to the orders of the Director and council.

"XXIII. Whosoever, whether colonists of Patroons for their Patroons, or free persons for themselves, or other particulars for their masters, shall discover any shores, bays, or other fit places for erecting fisheries, or the making of salt ponds, they may take possession thereof, and begin to work on them in their own absolute property, to the exclusion of all others. And it is consented to that the Patroons of colonists may send ships along the coast of New Netherland, on the cod fishery, and

with the fish they catch to trade to Italy, or other neutral countries, paying in such cases to the company for recognition six guilders (\$2.40) per last; and if they should come with their lading hither, they shall be at liberty to proceed to Italy, though they shall not, under pretext of this consent, or from the company, carry any goods there, on pain of arbitrary punishment; and it remaining in the breast of the company to put a supercargo on board each ship, as in the eleventh article.

"XXIV. In case any of the colonists should, by his industry and diligence, discover any minerals, precious stones, crystals, marbles, or such like, or any pearl fishery, the same shall be and remain the property of the Patroon or Patroons of such colony; giving and ordering the discoverer such premium as the Patroon shall beforehand have stipulated with such colonists by contract. And the Patroons shall be exempt from all recognition to the company for the term of eight years, and pay only for freight, to bring them over, two per cent., and after the expiration of the aforesaid eight years, for recognition and freight, the one-eighth part of what the same may be worth.

"XXV. The company will take all the colonists, as well free as those that are in service, under their protection, and the

Here was another element of aristocracy to be tested on the continent, and to be made subordinate to Democracy. It was a necessary specimen to be exhibited in its results. The experiment found safety in its limits; and all the good that could come from it was realized without any of its dangers. Its temporary inconveniences are of but little consequence when compared to the extent of its practical influences.

The Dutch West India Company were faithful to the property element from first to last. They first attempted to serve themselves, and then the aristocracy. They were first disappointed, and then mastered. The people, who had been counted nothing by either party, soon had the power to destroy the controlling influence of both; and what began in oppression ended in the blessings of Democracy. Thus was laid the broad basis of the Empire State. The property influence ranged upon the entire scale of enterprise, from the profits of the meanest laborer to the income of the feudal lord. The "Dutch Republicans" asserted the dignity of citizenship, and the patroons soon realized that they could ask for nothing higher. Such a beginning afforded noble opportunities to test the conquering principles of Democracy, and to exhibit its glorious triumphs in every form of unparalleled prosperity.¹ The massive machinery of monopoly, sustained by the government of a proud and persevering republic, was made to yield to individual enterprise; and what

same against all outlandish and inlandish wars and powers, with the forces they have there, as much as lies in their power, defend.

"XXVI. Whosoever shall settle any colonie out of the limits of the Manhattes Island, shall be obliged to satisfy the Indians for the land they shall settle upon, and they may extend or enlarge the limits of their colonies if they settle a proportionate number of colonists thereon.

"XXVII. The Patroons and colonists shall in particular, and in the speediest manner, endeavor to find out ways and means whereby they may support a minister and schoolmaster, that thus the service of God and zeal for religion may not grow cool, and be neglected among them; and that they do, for the first, procure a comforter of the sick there.

"XXVIII. The colonies that shall happen to lie on the respective rivers or islands (that is to say, each river or island for itself) shall be at liberty to appoint a deputy, who shall give information to the commander and council of that Western

quarter of all things relating to his colonie, and who are to further matters relating thereto, of which deputies there shall be one altered, or changed, in every two years; and all colonies shall be obliged, at least once in every twelve months, to make exact report of their colonie and lands thereabout, to the commander and council there, in order to be transmitted hither.

"XXIX. The colonists shall not be permitted to make any woollen, linen or cotton cloth, nor weave any other stuffs there, on pain of being banished, and as perjurers to be arbitrarily punished.

"XXX. The company will use their endeavors to supply the colonists with as many blacks as they conveniently can, on the conditions hereafter to be made; in such manner, however, that they shall not be bound to do it for a longer time than they shall think proper.

"XXXI. The company promises to finish the fort on the island of the Manhattes, and to put it in a posture of defence without delay."

See APPENDIX F, p. 633.

was designed to fill the strong coffers of Holland became the gain of its humblest sons and their most worthy descendants. Their characteristics are briefly given by Chancellor Kent. He says: "They were grave, temperate, firm, persevering men, who brought with them the industry, the economy, the simplicity, the integrity and the bravery, of their Belgic sires; and with those virtues they also imported the lights of the Roman civil law, and the purity of the Protestant faith."

But New York was surrendered to be dismembered by a papist, and by a papist to be blessed with the institutions of freedom.¹ A portion of the territory, before the conquest, had been assigned, by the Duke of York, to Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, and called New Jersey.

New Jersey was soon characterized by the godly government of the Puritans; and the people of New York, after passing through many changes, asserted the Democratic platform in their charter of liberties. Both colonies had the political benefit of repeated contests between England and Holland, and both colonies had opportunities to study political economy in the examples of practice to be seen in the people of different religious creeds, and to discover that where Democracy prevailed toleration and prosperity followed as consequences.

The party contests of New York, after its surrender to the English, were in keeping with the character of the people already established. Collisions between the royal governors and the colonial assemblies were constant, bitter, and exciting. Merchants² and large landholders³ saw their true interests in

¹ In 1683, Thomas Dongan, a papist, was appointed governor of New York, "with instructions to convoke a free legislature."—See *Bancroft*, VOL. II, 414.

The assembly consisted of seventeen members, and never exceeded twenty-seven down to the commencement of the Revolutionary War. It exercised a discretionary power as to the grant of supplies for the support of government. This was a constant source of difference between the assemblies and the governors,—the latter invariably wishing for a permanent provision. Fletcher began the struggle in 1696, and it continued as long as England appointed governors for New York.—See *Dunlap*, VOL. I, 124.

On the 17th of October, 1683, "about seventy years after Manhattan was first occupied," says Bancroft (II., 414), "about thirty years after the demand of the popular convention by the Dutch, the representatives of the people met in assembly; and their self-established 'Charter of Liberties'

gave New York a place by the side of Virginia and Massachusetts.

"The 'Charter of Liberties' declared 'supreme legislative power' shall forever be and reside in the governor, council and people, met in general assembly. Every freeholder and freeman shall vote for representation without restraint. No freeman shall suffer but by judgment of his peers; and all trials shall be by a jury of twelve men. No tax shall be assessed, on any pretence whatever, but by the consent of the assembly. No seaman or soldier shall be quartered on the inhabitants against their will. No martial law shall exist. No person, professing faith in God by Jesus Christ, shall at any time be anyways disquieted or questioned for any difference of opinion."

² In a letter to the Board of Trade, 1752, Clinton says, "The faction in this province consists chiefly of merchants."—"Entire disregard of the laws of trade."

³ The large landholders—whose grants, originally prodigal, irregular and ill-defined,

Democracy,¹ and the property power and the people became allies.

But there were other experiments in colonization based upon the property element, and in New England. The character of Massachusetts was tested as the proprietor of Maine; and the contrast between her government and that of Holland over New York affords an instructive lesson in history.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.²

New Hampshire was made the subject of sale and mortgage by speculators; but character had been established before interest, and rights were prized above property. A few hardy adventurers were the pioneers of this region, who, though not impelled by the zeal of the Puritan, were well fitted for the labors of the forest, and the dangers of a wilderness inhabited by the savage. They were soon to be helped, however, by the persecutions of Scotland and Massachusetts; and the dissenters of two hemispheres met to embrace among the granite hills.

"The first settlers of New Hampshire," says Barstow, "were a few merchant adventurers.³ They were not distinguished for literature or religion. They did not come, like the Pilgrims,

'Breaking the depths of the desert's gloom
With their hymns of lofty cheer.'

promised opulence for generations—were equally jealous of British authority, which threatened to bound their pretensions, or question their titles, or, through Parliament, to impose a land tax.—*Bancroft*, Vol. IV, p. 147.

¹ (1691). Dunlap says, "Jacob Leisler, a simple burgher and merchant, becomes a dignified object, when the choice of his fellow-burghers, freeholders of New York, place him as their commander-in-chief, in opposition to the lieutenant-governor of the tyrant and bigot James, for the purpose of preserving civil liberty. Party, which is indispensable to popular government, may be said, if not to have had its birth at the time in New York, at least to have taken its 'form and pressure' as it exists in this day. We see in that party of which Leisler was the head the germ of our present democratic representative government."—*Hist. N. Y.*, Vol. I, p. 210.

The error of tracing the origin of parties to *circumstances*, instead of *principles*, is a common one. This will be made obvious in a future chapter, that will be devoted to notices of distinguished Democrats of

all ages, with a classification of subjects upon which they have acted.

² New Hampshire was discovered by Captain John Smith, in 1614. In 1623 the first settlement was made at Dover and Little Harbor, near Portsmouth, under a grant obtained of the Plymouth Company, in 1622, by Gorges and Mason. The territory comprised in the grant was called *Laconia*, and it embraced a part of the present State of Maine. In 1629 the name of *New Hampshire* was given to this territory. In 1641 the people placed themselves under the government of Massachusetts, and thus remained till 1680, when New Hampshire became a separate royal province. In 1686 the authority of Andros was extended over the province; but when he was deposed, the people of New Hampshire took the government into their own hands. In 1690 they again placed themselves under Massachusetts; were separated again in 1692, and once more annexed in 1699. In 1741 Massachusetts and New Hampshire were severed for the last time.

³ In the council of Plymouth there were two men whose fame belongs to New Hamp-

Yet they were, like them, a bold and hardy few. Forsaking their English homes in quest of better fortune, they opened a path over the ocean, and chose the wildest solitudes of nature for the scene of their experiment. Their energy and perseverance, their fortitude and courage, made them the terror of the Indians, and fitted them for the struggles of freedom against oppression. They were obliged to fight and conquer a savage foe. They gained their subsistence by a constant warfare against the obstacles of nature. They went out to the field of toil with arms in their hands. While with their axes they bowed the woods, their firelocks leaned against the nearest trees. Their swords hung at their sides. In the character of these men avarice and romance were blended.

"After them came a band of the persecuted. They were driven from a neighboring colony 'for conscience' sake.' These shared the perils of the others. Their character took its impress from the troubled scenes in which their lives were passed. Their days, also, were devoted to the fields of toil and battle. Their descendants were nurtured from childhood in the midst of hardships. They were taught in the school of adversity. Resolution, firmness of purpose and patient endurance, impress themselves on their character, and mark their history.

"The next and most brilliant period of New Hampshire colonization is that which is connected with the history of Scotland. The border romances, the songs of the bard, the Covenanter's honest faith, and all the proud recollections and glorious memories of the land of Burns, were to be transported

shire. These were Ferdinando Gorges and Captain John Mason. In 1622 they resolved to unite their fortunes. They procured a joint grant of the province of Laconia. This comprised all the land between the rivers Merrimac and Sagadahock, extending back to the great lakes and the river St. Lawrence. In 1629 Laconia was divided between Mason and Gorges. The wild region east of Piscataqua was relinquished to Gorges, and took the name of Maine; while the tract west of this river, and extending back into the country sixty miles, was confirmed to Mason. He had resided in the county of Hampshire, England, and he called this grant New Hampshire. Both Gorges and Mason were deluded by golden dreams, and attempted no settlement but with motives to wealth, and did not even establish a government. Previous to the surrender of the patent of New England to the king, Gorges and

Mason had taken care to secure to themselves some portion of the expiring interest. That of Mason comprehended both of his former patents; and, in September following, Gorges sold to him a tract of land on the north-east side of the Piscataqua.

Mason died in 1635; and in 1692 his heirs sold their title to New Hampshire to Samuel Allen, of London, who was appointed governor. He did not come to America till 1698, and his administration lasted but one year. He revived the Masonian claim; and, after his death, his son again in 1715, but without success. The death of the son relieved the people of this long and distracting controversy.—See *Barstow's New Hampshire*. So far as possible examples of history are given in the language of the best writers. If the student would fully understand their teachings he should read the entire works from which they are taken.

to the wild woods of New Hampshire. They came with the settlers of Londonderry.¹

In 1641, when New Hampshire was united to Massachusetts, "four distinct governments had been formed on the several branches of the Piscataqua. These combinations were but voluntary agreements. They might be invaded by capricious leaders, or dashed asunder by the first wave of popular discontent. The people were too much divided to form any general plan of government, and the distracted state of the mother country cut off all hope of the royal attention. In this state of things, the minds of the more considerate men were turned to a union with Massachusetts. The affair was agitated for more than a year; and, on the 14th of April, 1641, it was concluded by an instrument of union, subscribed in the presence of the General Court. Thus did Massachusetts spread her jurisdiction over the Piscataqua settlements. Her laws now took immediate effect in New Hampshire, and the histories of the two plantations, for a period of thirty-eight years, become blended together. The population of New Hampshire at this time did not exceed one thousand, which was about one-twentieth of the whole population of the American Colonies. When the act of union took place, one extraordinary concession was made to New Hampshire. By a law of Massachusetts, a test had been established which provided that none but church-members should vote in town affairs, or sit as members of the General Court. This gospel requisite was dispensed with in favor of New Hampshire members, and her freemen were permitted to vote in town affairs, and her deputies to sit in the General Court, without regard to religious qualifications; an amazing stride in liberality,—a stretch of toleration, which some declared to amount to absolute atheism, and others looked upon as the entering wedge of impiety, destined to sunder the goodly bands of society. It sent a shudder through the whole body of the church.

"Under the new order of things, Wheelright² was no longer safe. His sentence of banishment was still in force; and when the laws of Massachusetts took effect in New Hampshire, he was obliged to make another remove to escape the sword of persecution. Attended by a few faithful followers, he withdrew to Wells, in Maine, and there gathered a small church. He was afterwards permitted to return, and exercise his ministry at Hampton."³

The proprietors of this territory had not learned to distinguish between ownership in land and the rights of man. They saw no sovereignty but in

¹ Barstow, p. 6.

² Wheelright and Cromwell were at the university together. When Cromwell was Lord Protector, Wheelright visited England, and was received very kindly by his old acquaintance. "I remember the time,"

said Cromwell, turning to the gentlemen then about him, "when I have been more afraid of meeting Wheelright at football than of meeting any army since in the field."—*Barstow*, p. 54.

³ Barstow, p. 53.

property, and claimed a jurisdiction coëxtensive with geographical boundaries, regardless of the occupants of the soil. The character of this sovereignty was soon summarily exemplified by the English government in the decision that the unoccupied lands only were subject to their control, and that all questions of title to the soil which had been improved must be submitted to the colonial courts. Thus England acknowledged a sovereignty in the Democracy of New Hampshire, and the claimants of Mason found themselves simply citizens among others, and placed upon the common level of equal rights. To give form to the colony, with a view to coöperate with the proprietors, and to adjust their interests as connected with those of the people, New Hampshire was separated from Massachusetts, and made a royal province.

A governor was appointed, and conditions declared in respect to government. The conditions of the king and the proprietary were defined, and the rights of the people explained, but not conceded. Royalty asserted a sovereignty in an alliance with the representatives of property, and a party was organized to execute the narrow purposes of the unholy coalition.¹ The people were distracted by frequent lawsuits, judges were blinded by corruption, juries packed,² and even the old machinery of ecclesiastical power was turned upon its rusted pivots, to aid men who could neither dispense justice as the agents of the throne, nor comprehend the reasonableness of its connection with their particular interests. But the people were alive to the full exercise of their rights, and the spirit of Democracy asserted self-government with an independence that was in harmony with their character, though at war with the self-complacent enemies of popular liberty.³ A Democratic party was organized, associations formed, and party contests were of frequent occurrence among the people and in the assembly. Property soon became subor-

¹ In 1682, when the claim of Mason was revived, "by a deed, Mason surrendered to the king one-fifth part of all quit-rents, for the support of the governor, and gave to Cranfield (who had been appointed governor, and who had no motives above those of speculation) a mortgage of the whole province for twenty-one years, as collateral security for the payment of his salary."—*Bancroft*, Vol. II, 117.

² In a petition (1685) from "loyal subjects" of New Hampshire to his majesty, they say "that they had, for more than fifty years, been peaceably possessed of the lands lately challenged by Mr. Mason," &c.—*Belknap*, Vol. I. App. xcii.

"That for the last two years and upward during the whole management of Mr.

Mason's suits at law against your majesty's subjects, there hath been generally one jury returned to serve all the said issues with little alterations and almost constantly one foreman (who for that end wee are apt to feare) was early complied with by Mr. Mason for all the lands in his own possession formerly, with addition of several other lands to his owne proffitt."—*Belknap*, Vol. I, xcii., xciii. App.

³ In 1680 a general assembly was convened at Portsmouth. The rights of the colony were asserted by a solemn decree, the first in their new code: "No act, imposition, law, ordinance, shall be valid, unless made by the assembly and approved by the people." Thus did New Hampshire seize the earliest moment of its separate exist-

dinate to principle, and conservatism gradually surrendered to Democracy.

New Hampshire was surrounded and filled with circumstances favorable to growth, strength, and independence. Its proximity to Massachusetts, and the lofty training to which it was so long subjected by so powerful a neighbor; its uninterrupted beginning and early establishment in the great principles of Democracy; the unanimity of its people in defending their rights against the encroachments of the king and his agents,—were sources of enlarged views, inspiring encouragements, and confirming resolutions.

GEORGIA.¹

But in singular contrast with the experiment of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, another and a nobler principle remained to be tested in the last of the thirteen colonies, Georgia.

This was purely an experiment of benevolence,—a colony to be based upon “charity, that beautiful and winning grace, that diamond cincture, which binds together the fair sisterhood of virtues.” It was a noble tribute to the brightest features of humanity, and a magnificent test of public sentiment in England.

That the first successful colony should be a company of exiles, and that the last emanation of the colonizing spirit of Great Britain to America should be an act of good-will towards the unfortunate, presents a phase in life as beautiful as it is extraordinary. The Earl of Chesterfield may have deemed a parliamentary connection between royalty and charity “indecent,” but such a fastidious sensibility would hardly be sustained by public opinion, either in its fretful moods or reflective moments.²

ence to express the great principle of self-government, and take her place by the side of Massachusetts and Virginia. The code was disapproved in England, “both for style and matter; and its provisions were rejected as incongruous and absurd.”—*Bancroft*, Vol. II, 116.

¹ In 1729 a project was formed for the settlement of a colony upon the unoccupied territory between the rivers Savannah and Altamaha, to be called Georgia. Upon application, George II. granted a charter, in 1732, to the company, consisting of Lord Percival and twenty others, among whom was the celebrated Oglethorpe, and incorporated them by the name of the Trustees for establishing the Colony of Georgia in America. In 1752 the charter was surren-

dered to the crown, and Georgia became a royal province.

² An appropriation bill was proposed in Parliament (1733), in which several different objects were provided for, and, among them, one for granting the Princess Royal a marriage portion, another for the new colony in Georgia, &c. When under discussion in the House of Lords, the Earl of Chesterfield said, “My Lords, I do not rise up to oppose the bill now before us; but I think it is incumbent upon me to declare that it is, in my opinion, a most indecent thing to provide for the Princess Royal of England in such a manner:—it is most disrespectful to the royal family to provide a marriage portion for so illustrious a branch of that family in such a bill of items. Here is,

Men have not yet ceased to theorize, and to try experiments narrowed to a small fraction of their elements, and adding still to the experience of the past, that no theory will be confirmed by the practical tests of time, unless framed with distinct purposes, comprehending all the faculties of the mind in their greatest activity in relation to external objects. The faculties are to be trained and developed together. They are to be applied to the discernment of things, of people, and of nations, as they exist together. Isolation in philosophy is an absurdity. Nothing is to be studied by itself. All things were made for some purpose, and bear to one another a certain relationship which teaches the great truth of adaptation in the parts, and a harmony in the whole. A single idea, a single faculty, may travel forward in advance of its natural company, it may be, to prepare the way for its companions or contemporaries, but it either has to wait their arrival, or to return to their circle, before it can enter into a full and complete demonstration to show its truth or practical importance. The subdivision of labor gives to every man the work for which he is peculiarly fitted. The world is infinite in its variety, and no part of this variety can be neglected or detached with impunity. The composition of progress is a unity,—and as the planets throw off from their surface occasional fragments, to be returned toward their centres by the laws of gravitation, so progress, in the flights of mind, springs from the active in society, to be returned to the common bosom of thought.

In 1729, “A committee was appointed by Parliament to inquire into the state of the jails of the kingdom, and to report the same, and their opinions thereupon, to the house.” “This committee,” says Stevens, “raised on the motion of James Oglethorpe, Esq.,¹ in consequence of the barbarities

imprimis, five hundred thousand pounds for the current service of the year. Item, ten thousand pounds by way of charity for those distressed persons who are to transport themselves to the colony of Georgia. Item, so much by way of charity for repairing an old church, &c.” But the Earl of Chesterfield was not alone in his horror of such a monstrous contiguity of dissimilar items. The Earl of Winchelsea said, “I cannot but take notice of that part of the bill by which eighty thousand pounds is granted as a portion for the Princess Royal. It is so unbecoming a thing to see that grant made in such a hotch-potch bill,” &c. “I am sorry to see her name so much as mentioned in such a riffraff bill,” &c.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. ix, p. 120.

¹ The family of Oglethorpe was one of the most ancient in England. It may be traced backwards eight hundred years, to the Norman conquest. William Oglethorpe, the great-grandfather of James, the founder of Georgia, was a member of the household of King Charles the First. His grandfather was page to Charles II.; and his father, Sir Theophilus, was with the Duke of Monmouth in the battle of Bothwell Bridge, was an officer of distinction under the Duke of York and afterwards first equerry and major-general of the army of King James II. Though politically an adherent to the fortunes of James, he was so unkindly used on account of his religion—being a decided Protestant—that he soon returned to England, and purchased

which had fallen under his own observation while visiting some debtors in the Fleet and Marshalsea prisons, consisted of ninety-six persons, and Ogle-

a seat called Westbrook Place, near the town of Godalming, in Surrey, whither he retired from the jealousies of courts and the toils of party strife. On this elegant estate James Oglethorpe was born, on the 21st of December, 1688, a year memorable for the revolution which gave to England that democratic bill of rights which has been justly styled "her second Magna Charta." He was the seventh in a family of nine children, most of whom became eminent for their station or service. At the age of sixteen, James was entered at Oxford University, and six years after was commissioned as ensign in the English army. He was early promoted, and early acquired a high reputation in the art of war. In 1722 he was elected member of Parliament for Hazlemere, the same borough which had been so long represented by his father, his brother Lewis, and his brother Theophilus; and for thirty-two years he was returned by successive elections to the House of Commons. During this period he was placed on important committees, and had much influence. He was distinguished for readily yielding his name, and influence, and fortune, to schemes of charity and philanthropy.

It is an interesting fact in his history, that he lived to see his infant colony become a great and free state. Among the earliest to call on John Adams, the first ambassador of the United States to the court of St. James, was Oglethorpe. On the 22d of February, 1765, he was made general of all his majesty's forces, and for many years before he died was at the head of the army list as the oldest general officer of Great Britain. The assertion has been frequently made, though the authority is not conclusive, that, being the senior of Sir William Howe, he had offered to him the command of the forces destined to subjugate America in the war of the Revolution, but that he declined the appointment, assuring the ministry that "he knew the Americans well; that they never would be subdued

by arms, but that obedience would be secured by doing them justice." That his political sympathies were with the Americans, may be learned incidentally from the circumstance, that, on meeting in London with Governor Bernard, of Massachusetts, who had been most active in planning and executing "deep and studied affronts to that province," then struggling for civil rights and immunities, and whom the American-hating court had honored with a baronetcy for his services to regal tyranny, Oglethorpe personally expressed to him "the utmost disgust and abhorrence of his conduct."

Though Oglethorpe had his defects of character and his enemies, he did not go unhonored and undefended even in his own age. Poets such as Pope, and Thomson, and Goldsmith, and Brown, sung his praises; moralists such as Johnson, the Abbé Raynal, Wharton, and Hannah More, testified to his virtues; divines such as Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, and Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, and Benson, and the Wesleys, did honor to his goodness; generals such as Prince Eugene, and the Duke of Marlborough and field marshal, acknowledged his abilities; and statesmen such as the Duke of Argyle, and Lord Peterborough, and Edmund Burke, lauded his distinguished merits.

From the council-fires of the mountain Indians, from the lowly huts of the enfranchised debtors in Savannah, from the cells of the prisons of England, from the fire-sides made cheerful by his bounty, rose a tribute to his worth more grateful to his soul than all the distinctions which royalty could confer or senates confirm. He died, of a sudden illness, at his seat, Cranham Hall, on the 30th of June, 1785, aged ninety-seven.—See *History of Georgia*, by Wm. B. Stevens, M. D., now Episcopal Bishop of Pa., Vol. I, a work of great ability and interest, and from which most of these particulars are compiled.

thorpe was made its chairman. A more honorable or effective committee could scarcely have been appointed. It embraced some of the first men in England,—among them thirty-eight noblemen, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Master of Rolls, Admiral Vernon, and Field Marshal Wade. They entered upon their labors with zeal and diligence, and not only made inquiries through the Fleet prison, but also into the Marshalsea, the prison of the King's Bench, and the jail for the county of Surrey. It was this committee which Thomson eulogized, in his poem of Winter, as

‘The generous band
Who, touched with human woe, redressive searched
Into the horrors of the gloomy gaol.’

For in these abodes of crime and misfortune they beheld all that the poet had depicted: ‘The freeborn Briton to the dungeon chained,’ marked ‘with inglorious stripes:’ the ‘lean morsel snatched from the starving mouth;’ ‘the tattered weed torn from cold wintry limbs;’ and ‘lives crushed out by secret, barbarous ways, that for their country would have toiled and bled.’ Nor in this instance did the poetry exceed the fact; for one of her own authors has well said, ‘No modern nation has ever enacted or inflicted greater legal severities upon insolvent debtors than England.’ ‘For the encouragement of that ready credit by which commercial enterprise is promoted, they armed the creditor of insolvent debtors with vindictive powers, by the exercise of which freeborn Englishmen, unconvicted of crime, were frequently subjected, in the metropolis of Britain, to a thralldom as vile and afflicting as the bondage of negro slaves in the West Indies.’ This committee, besides redressing the grievances connected with prison discipline, also reported a bill for the relief of insolvent debtors; thus not only remedying present abuses, but preventing their recurrence, by legislative enactment.”

With philanthropic motives ranging beyond parliamentary duty, Oglethorpe, joined by Lord Percival and a few other noblemen and gentlemen, addressed a memorial to the Privy Council, stating “that the cities of London, Westminster, and parts adjacent, do abound with great numbers of indigent persons, who are reduced to such necessity as to become burdensome to the public, and who would be willing to seek a livelihood in any of his majesty’s plantations in America, if they were provided with a passage, and means of settling there.” The memorialists promised to take upon themselves the entire charge of this affair; to erect a province into a proprietary government, provided the crown would grant them a portion of the land bought in 1729 by Parliament from the lords proprietors of South Carolina, lying south of the Savannah river, together with such powers as shall enable them to receive the charitable contributions and benefactions of all such persons as are willing to encourage so good a design.”

A charter was granted on the 9th of June, 1732, “giving to the projected

colony the name of the monarch who had granted to them such a liberal territory for the development of their benevolence."¹

This charter is marked by interesting peculiarities, and is worthy of an attentive perusal. It is thus spoken of by Stevens:

"By the provisions of this charter, which commenced with a recital of the causes which led to the proposed colonization, this body was entitled, for twenty-one years, to all the legal rights and immunities of a body corporate. They were to meet yearly, on the third Thursday in the month of March, when new members were to be elected. They were to have a common council, of fifteen members; and when the members of the corporation were increased, the common council was also to be augmented to twenty-four. The offices of president, of the trustees, and chairman of the board of common council, were to be rotary by election. The members of the corporation were debarred from holding any office of profit, or receiving any salary, fees, perquisite or profit, whatsoever. They were authorized to take subscriptions and collect moneys; and were required to lay, annually, before the chancellor, or speaker, or commissioners for the custody of the great seal of Great Britain, an account of all moneys and effects by them received or expended. They were empowered to make constitutions, laws and ordinances, for the government of their province; to set, impose and inflict reasonable pains and penalties upon offenders. It granted to them 'all those lands, countries and territories situate, lying and being in that part of South Carolina, in America,' between the Savannah and Altamaha; and westerly, from the heads of the said rivers, respectively, in direct lines, to the Pacific, and the islands within twenty leagues of the coasts. It gave them permission to transport and convey out of Great Britain into the said province of Georgia, to be there settled, as many subjects, or foreigners willing to become subjects, as shall be willing to inhabit there. It also declared, that 'all and every the persons' 'born within the said province, shall have and enjoy all liberties, franchises and immunities, of free denizens, as if abiding and born within Great Britain.' It also established and ordained that there shall be liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all persons inhabiting, or who shall inhabit, or be resident within the province; and that all such persons, except papists, shall have a free exercise of religion, so they be contented with the quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the same, not giving offence or scandal to the government. It was further provided, that no grant of land should to be made to any one of the corporation, or to any one in trust for any

¹ In the London Magazine for October, 1735, are the following lines, "On giving the name of Georgia to a part of Carolina."—*Stevens' Georgia*, p. 68.

"While, ripening slow, the future purpose lay,
And conscious silence planned the opening way,

Kind o'er the rising schemes an angel hung,
And dropped this counsel from his guardian tongue:
Wish you, this way, the royal pair inclined?
To Carolina be a Georgia joined;
Then shall both colonies sure progress make,
Endeared to either for the other's sake;
Georgia shall Carolina's favor move,
And Carolina bloom by Georgia's love."

member of the same; and no grant of land to any other individual was to exceed five hundred acres. They were authorized, also, to establish judicatories, courts of record, or other necessary courts, embracing all cases which could come within the limits of colonial judiciary, whether criminal or civil, capital or venial. It decreed, that no act of the common council or corporation should be effectual and valid, unless eight members, including the chairman, should be present. It permitted this board to appoint whatever magistrates, civil or military, by land or sea, the province required, except such as were connected with the revenue department. It required them to defend the province by all military means, both by sea and land, against either internal or external foes. It constituted the Governor of South Carolina chief commander of the Georgia militia; and, finally, declared that at the expiration of twenty-one years, such a government should be established as should then be judged best, in which the governor, and all officers, civil and military, should be nominated and appointed by the king.

“This was the great legal instrument which lay at the political foundation of Georgia. Its provisions were commensurate with its design, and its privileges were as ample as the benevolence which called it into being. It gave to those over whom it stretched its fostering care the privileges of freeborn Britons—the privileges of English law, and, with one exception, the privileges of religious liberty. Nor was this exception the result so much of England’s Protestantism as England’s politics. It was but transferring to the charter of Georgia some of the civil disabilities which then lay upon Romanists in the mother country,—disabilities growing out of civil rather than ecclesiastical relations. The exception was wrong in the abstract; but, interposing itself as Georgia did between the Protestant colonies on the north, and the French and Spanish possessions on the south, it was determined to draw around it such ecclesiastical cordon as should effectually prevent any Romish intrigues or ascendancy in a colony thus singularly situated.

“The charter revealed two purposes as the object of this colonization—the settling of poor but unfortunate people on lands now waste and desolate; and the interposing of this colony as a barrier between the northern colonies and the French, Spanish and Indians, on the south and west.”

The movement of Oglethorpe and his associates was of so extraordinary a nature that the reader will readily understand the importance of a full knowledge of their motives, and of the means by which they proposed to accomplish their beneficent as well as their national ends. Their purposes were of a democratic nature,—but their plans of operation were either too great or too small to harmonize, and their principles either too partial or too conservative for progress.

“But,” continues the same able writer, “the colony was not to be confined to the poor and unfortunate. The trustees granted portions of five

hundred acres to such as went over at their own expense, on condition that they carried over one servant to every fifty acres, and did military service in time of war or alarm. Thus the materials of the new colony consisted of three classes ; the upper, or large landed proprietors and officers,—the middle, or freeholders, sent over by the trustees, and the servants indented to that corporation or to private individuals.

“ Subsidiary to the great design of philanthropy was the further purpose of making Georgia a silk, wine, oil, and drug growing colony. ‘ Lying,’ as the trustees remark, ‘ about the same latitude with part of China, Persia, Palestine, and the Madeiras, it is highly probable that when hereafter it shall be well peopled and rightly cultivated, England may be supplied from thence with raw silk, wine, oil, dyes, drugs, and many other materials for manufactures, which she is obliged to purchase from southern countries.’ The secretary of the trustees, in his official account of the ‘ Reasons for Establishing the Colony of Georgia,’ says : ‘ The Italian, French, Dutch, Indian, and China silks, imported, thrown and wrought only (including what are clandestinely run), may, on the most moderate computation, be reckoned to cost us five hundred thousand pounds per annum ; which may all be saved by raising the raw silk in Georgia, and afterwards working it up here, now we have attained the arts of making raw silk into organzine, and preparing it for our weavers, who can weave it into all sorts of wrought silks in as great perfection as any nation of the world ; so that we only want the staple (or raw silk) and to have it at a reasonable rate. With this Georgia will abundantly supply us, if we are not wanting to ourselves, and do not neglect the opportunity which Providence has thrown into our hands. The saving this five hundred thousand pounds per annum is not all ; but our supplying ourselves with raw silk from Georgia carries this further advantage along with it, that it will provide a new or additional employment for at least twenty thousand people in Georgia for about four months in the year, during the silk season, and at least twenty thousand more of our poor here, all the year round, in working the raw silk, and preparing such manufactures as we send in return, or to purchase the said raw silk in Georgia, to which country our merchants will trade to much greater advantage than they can expect to do in Italy ; and yet the exportation to this place will (as I said before) be, in all probability, preserved.’

“ Oglethorpe, also, in his ‘ New and Accurate Account,’ writes, ‘ We shall be their market for great quantities of raw silk ; perhaps for wine, oil, cotton, drugs, dyeing stuffs, and many other lesser commodities. They have already tried the vine and the silk-worm, and have all imaginable encouragement to expect that these will prove most valuable staple commodities to them. The raw silk which Great Britain and Ireland are able to consume will employ forty or fifty thousand persons in that country. Nor need they be the strongest or most industrious part of mankind : it must be a weak hand

indeed that cannot earn bread where silk-worms and white mulberry-trees are so plenty. The present medium of our importation of silk will not be the measure hereafter of that branch of trade, when the Georgians shall enter into the management of the silk-worm. Great Britain will then be able to sell silk manufactures cheaper than all Europe besides; because the Georgians may grow rich, and yet afford their raw silk for less than half the price that we now pay for that of Piedmont. The peasant of Piedmont, after he has tended the worm and wound off the silk, pays half of it for the rent of the mulberry-trees and the eggs of the silk-worm; but in Georgia the working hand will have the benefit of all his labor. This is fifty in a hundred, or cent. per cent., difference in favor of the Georgians; which receives a great addition from another consideration, namely, the Georgian will have his provisions incomparably cheaper than the Piedmontese, because he pays no rent for the land that produces them—he lives upon his own estate. But there is still another reason why Great Britain should quickly and effectually encourage the production of silk in Georgia,—for, in effect, it will cost us nothing: it will be purchased by the several manufacturers of Great Britain, and this, I fear, is not our present case with respect to Piedmont, especially if (as we have been lately told) they have prohibited the importation of woollen goods in that principality.’

“Wine was to be raised in sufficient quantities, not only for part of our consumption at home, but also for the supply of our other plantations, instead of our going to Madeira for it. Flax, hemp and potashes, were to be produced in such abundance that the balance of trade with Russia was to be reduced one hundred and thirty thousand pounds; and indigo, cochineal, olives, dyeing woods, and drugs of various kinds, were to be as abundant as the demand for their consumption.

“Incident to their primary design was the expectation of thereby relieving the mother country of a body of indigent paupers and unfortunate debtors. It was argued, that these people were not only unprofitable, but absolutely an expense to the government; that their detention in England was a physical, moral and pecuniary loss to the nation; while their emigration to America not only freed the country from those who would otherwise be burdensome to its charities, but made them profitable to themselves, to Georgia, and to England itself; and Livy was quoted, to show that the Romans often sent some of their citizens abroad for the very increase of her power.

“Thus, the poor-rates were to be reduced, the parishes relieved, the work-houses emptied, the debtors’ prisons thrown open, and even the population of the kingdom advanced, by the plantation of Georgia.

“The extension of Christianity was another aim which they kept in view. They reasoned, that the good discipline established by the society would reform the manners of those miserable objects who should be by them sub-

sisted; and the example of a whole colony, who should behave in a just, moral and religious manner, would contribute greatly towards the conversion of the Indians, and taking off the prejudices received from the profligate lives of such as have scarcely anything of Christianity but the name.

"Such were the principal purposes of the trustees in settling Georgia. Extravagance was their common characteristic; for, in the excited visions of its enthusiastic friends, Georgia was not only to rival Virginia and South Carolina, but to take the first rank in the list of provinces depending on the British crown. Neither the El Dorado of Raleigh nor the Utopia of More could compare with the garden of Georgia; and the poet, the statesman and the divine, lauded its beauties, and prophesied its future greatness."

"The trustees having selected from the throng of emigrants thirty-five families, numbering in all about one hundred and twenty-five 'sober, industrious and moral persons,' chartered the *Ann*, a galley of two hundred tons, Capt. John Thomas, and stationed her at Deptford, four miles below London, to receive her cargo and passengers.

"On the 16th November, 1732, they were visited by the trustees 'to see nothing was wanting, and to take leave' of Oglethorpe; and, having called the families separately before them in the great cabin, they inquired if they liked their usage and voyage, or if they had rather return, giving them even then the alternative of remaining in England, if they preferred it; and, having found but one man who (on account of his wife, left sick in Southwark) declined, they bid Oglethorpe and the emigrants an affectionate farewell." The ship sailed the next day, from Gravesend, bound for the continent of America.

It would be interesting and even profitable to follow the exciting events in detail which attended the early settlement of Georgia. To rejoice with the Israelite in his confidence that charity was about to end his wanderings;¹ to join the holy procession of the pious Salzburgers, and unite with them in their hymns of praise;² to dwell upon the spirit of the Puritans, who sought the land of good-will to establish it with their faith, and to cheer it with the blessings of Democracy;³ to sympathize with the sufferers from Acadia, and

¹ Among the early emigrants to Georgia were forty Jews, direct from London, who were sent out by authorized agents of the company, as consistent with the provisions of the charter, which gave freedom to all religions except that of the Church of Rome. The trustees expressed fears lest the public might suppose that they designed to "make a Jews' colony of Georgia." They desired Oglethorpe "to use his endeavors to prevent their settling with any of the grantees."

He did not respond to a request so discordant to the spirit of charity; "for to have done so," says Stevens, "would have been to strip the colony of its most moral, worthy and industrious citizens."

² See Stevens, p. 105.

³ When missionaries were wanted, at an early period, in South Carolina, Joseph Lord, "who was then teaching school in Dorchester, Mass., offered to go thither; and on the 22d of October, 1695, those

to witness their dispersion by a religious zeal that recognized no charity ; to accompany the benevolent trustees in their visits of love to Germany, to relieve the persecuted Protestant,—and to the highlands of Scotland, that they might secure a bold and hardy race, and withal a virtuous and industrious people ; to mark the throbbings of the mighty heart of humanity in the countless deeds of patient charity which from the confines of civilization seemed to centre in this great scheme of benevolence,—but these are beyond the limits of the present work.

It will be remembered that “ the design of the trustees comprised three points : to provide an asylum for the poor debtor and persecuted Protestant, to erect a silk, wine and drug growing colony ; and to relieve the mother country of an overburdened population.” “ It was not long, however, before their credulity was chastened into soberness by a series of disastrous calamities. The noble feature of benevolence was never indeed relinquished, even though the recipients proved unworthy of the bounty ; for, as early as 1735, the trustees declared that ‘ many of the poor, who had been useless in England, were inclined to be useless also in Georgia.’ And, though a strict scrutiny was made into the character and condition of each emigrant, most of the early settlers were altogether unworthy of the assistance they received. Once in Georgia, they were disappointed in the quality and fertility of the lands ; were unwilling to labor ; hung for support upon the trustees’ store ; were clamorous for privileges to which they had no right ; and fomented discontent and faction, where it was hoped they would have lived together in brotherly peace and charity. The benevolence of the trustees met no adequate return of gratitude ; and their labors for the welfare of the colony only provoked the obloquy and murmurs of those for whom had been opened the prison-doors of England, and to whom had been granted an asylum in Georgia. The too sanguine hopes of the trustees as to the commercial value of the colony were also destined to disappointment. The wine which was to supply all the plantations, and to cultivate which they had employed a vigneron from Portugal, and planted in their garden the choicest cuttings from Madeira, resulted in only a few gallons, and was then abandoned. The

designing to emigrate with him were embodied in a church, over which he was solemnly consecrated pastor. The churches of Boston, Milton, Newton, Charlestown and Roxbury, by their delegates or pastors, assisted in the services. Sixty years before, Dorchester had planted the first church in Connecticut ; and now she had gathered another, to send to the far distant borders of the south.” This church continued and prospered in Carolina until 1752,

when a majority of the members decided to remove to Georgia. “ The accession of such a people,” says Stevens, “ was an honor to Georgia, and has ever proved one of its richest blessings. The sons of that colony have shown themselves worthy of its sires ; their sires were the moral and intellectual nobility of the province.” They carried with them their New England habits, and established in Georgia the institutions of Democracy.—See *Stevens*, p. 386.

drugs and exotics, which, at a great expense, they had procured and planted in the same place; the olive trees from Venice, barilla-seed from Spain, the kali from Egypt, the cubebs cardimas, the caper plant, the madder root, and other like articles,—were mostly destroyed by the snow and frost shortly after they were planted. The hemp and flax, which were to sustain the linen manufactures of Great Britain, and throw the balance of trade with Russia into England's favor, never came to a single ship-load; and indigo, though there were one or two plantations of it near St. Simons and on the Altamaha, was never generally introduced, and its culture soon abandoned."

In respect to the success which attended their persevering efforts to produce silks, Stevens says: "At an expense, including passages of servants, provisions from the public store, bounty on cocoons, salaries, machines, basins, and filatures, of nearly fifteen hundred pounds, the trustees had succeeded in raising, up to the date of their surrender of the charter, not one thousand pounds of raw silk,—a most costly experiment for so poor a colony, showing the airiness of that dream in which they expected to save five hundred thousand pounds to England, and employ forty thousand of her subjects. 'They looked for much, and, lo! it came to little.'

"Nor were they more fortunate in relieving the mother country of her surplus indigent population. They did not, it is true, entertain the extravagant speculations of the Earl of Eglinton, who subsequently proposed to the king to introduce a hundred thousand settlers into Georgia and the Floridas, but they expected soon to locate twenty thousand persons in their territory, and build it up at once into a great commercial colony. It was estimated at the time, that, at a very small calculation, four thousand individuals were annually imprisoned for debt in England; and, though the scheme looked directly to the melioration and relief of this unfortunate class, yet what a paltry result, compared with such magnificent promises!

"During the first eight years, the trustees sent over on their bounty only nine hundred and fifteen British subjects; and the entire number transplanted to Georgia by their benefactions during their corporate existence did not exceed twelve hundred British, and one thousand foreign Protestants; and yet, in this time, they had received from private benefactions over seventeen thousand six hundred pounds, and from parliamentary grants over one hundred and thirty-six thousand six hundred pounds. Of those sent over by the charity of the trustees, two-thirds left the colony, and but a very few proved worthy of their benefactions. Thus, one by one, all the grand hopes of the trustees came to naught, every high expectation was laid low, and they were taught, by a dear-bought experience, that, however easy it was to plan a colony, it was quite another thing to carry it out into successful execution.

"But not only were the trustees destined to behold the blasting of their

agricultural and commercial views ; they were also made to feel the ill effects of their well-designed but badly-adjusted scheme of colonial legislation. They began wrong, when they resolved to make the tenure of their lands a grant in tail male. Instead of stepping forth in advance of their age, as they might have done, they retired behind it, going back to the middle ages, to feudal times, and drew thence, from the laws of the Salian Franks, this rule, as repugnant to reason as to justice."

As the period of the charter was about to expire, the trustees made arrangements that it might be surrendered with proper care and deliberation. A committee of twelve persons was appointed by the common council of the trustees, on the 25th of April, 1751, at the head of whom was the Earl of Shaftesbury, "to adjust with the administration the proper means for supporting and settling the colony for the future, and to take from time to time all such measures as they shall find necessary for its well-being." The surrender took place on the 23d of June, 1752 ; "and the corporation which had planted and nurtured Georgia ceased to exist."¹

When Oglethorpe was moved by the generous sympathies of humanity to take the prisoner by the hand, to lift up the fallen, to encourage the sad, to give joy to the desperate, to sustain the persecuted and the oppressed, and conceived the practicability of establishing a colony of such wounded spirits in the wilds of America, and had a confidence in the goodness and generosity of men to the remarkable extent that they would furnish the means for so noble a project,—he doubtless deemed the nature of the cause a sufficient guarantee of its success, and that he would be sustained by a community impressed by the grandeur of his motives, to be continually renewed by the redeeming power of gratitude. Their motto, on one side of their corporation seal,—"*Non sibi sed aliis*"—"Not for themselves, but others,"—expressed a beautiful truth and a fatal error. Not to include *themselves*, was a striking defect in so great a plan. On the other side of the seal were represented two figures reposing on urns,—emblematic of the boundary rivers,—having between them the genius of "Georgia Augusta," with a cap of liberty on her head, a spear in one hand, the horn of plenty in the other. "But the cap of liberty was, for a time at least," says Bancroft, "a false emblem ; for all executive and legislative power, and the institution of courts, were, for twenty-one years, given exclusively to the trustees, or their common council, who were appointed during good behavior."

The errors of the trustees have been denominated as those of "parsimonious benevolence." But this view mistakes sentiment for judgment. It was their benevolence that opened so many avenues to the enduring streams of charity,—but it was their judgment that failed to distinguish between a condition of success and a remedy for failure. Their desire to serve others

¹ Bishop Stevens, p. 258.

was surpassed only by the firmness of their convictions of confidence in themselves. By extending a generous spirit to those who had proved themselves wanting in judgment, they were doubtless impressed with the necessity of a prudent control.

The subjects of Oglethorpe's benevolence had passed through a large portion of the period of human existence, and had been prostrated. They had arrived at positions in society which either proved the want of capacity or the want of integrity. If honest, they were schismatics, or unfortunate men. If incapable, charity could aid them, but benevolence could not give them capacity. If dishonest, benevolence could cheer them in a temporary resolution, but could not give them integrity. If schismatical, charity could clothe the naked and feed the hungry, but benevolence could neither repress the opinions of the wilful, nor calm the impulsive and conflicting passions of the fanatical. The unfortunate could doubtless be rallied by the tender encouragements of good will; and unquestionably some of every class would exert themselves to the utmost in whatever promised success,—but what could be expected from an aggregation of feebleness, and from the discordant elements of every variety of failure, but results that such a combination is calculated to produce? With what significance may the question often be asked, “Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?”

What though some might still bring into action motives that had never been corrupted, combined with improved dispositions, renewed resolutions fortified by prudence and strengthened by example,—yet each would be loaded with his neighbor's defect or weakness, and the many that could not succeed at home, in a much stronger framework of society, as individuals, would fall, almost of necessity, when brought together in an atmosphere of endeavor so inferior to the one which they had left.

It is true that Oglethorpe joined with his motives of benevolence the objects of industry,—but one would have supposed that he could not avoid seeing that men, who had not even succeeded in taking care of themselves, would hardly be able to reach that point for the first time under circumstances so peculiar, and to travel beyond it to such an extent as to add wealth to the nation. It is quite true, he had counted, and not without reason, upon the coöperation of the best and ablest minds, everywhere, to aid him in the great work of reformation, and in the business of elevating or reëstablishing character,—but he began with an element of mistrust, by proposing an end which fell short of the dignity of man, and based his experiment upon conditional results. He neither promised the privileges of citizenship nor the responsibilities of legislation. His charity addressed his subjects as men, but his judgment disposed of them as paupers, or as objects of commiseration. A stream will not flow that has not an open outlet that tends to the bosom of its home; nor will the best influences of society recover a degraded man, when they do not tend to give him entire freedom

in all that constitutes a proper self-respect, and in all that shall recognize in him a member of society fitted for its duties and made eligible to its honors.

If the benevolence of Oglethorpe failed as the leading element of enterprise, it succeeded in teaching the great truth, that humanity has the benefit of generous projects as well as of selfish ones. And that, while avarice, with its mistakes and excesses, may hasten the accumulation of wealth, benevolence may have its share of error in opening patriotic avenues for its disbursements. The propensity to acquire does nothing but accumulate; benevolence extends and distributes. In the single action of either, excess is the result. What is true of these powers is true of all the others; and, to repeat a remark which has already been made, and which cannot be too constantly regarded, success is a result which comes from the activity of all the faculties in harmony with their objects and with one another.

MARYLAND.¹

The settlement of Maryland presents a variety of facts, so different in character, compared to those of the other colonies, that the reader will be

¹ The first settlement of Maryland was made by Captain William Clayborne, 1631, with a party of men from Virginia, on Kent Island, in Chesapeake Bay. But the charter under which the colony was permanently established was granted to Cecilus Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, by Charles I., and was dated June 20th, 1632. The province covered by this grant had been partially explored by Sir George Calvert, the father of Cecilus, four years before. It was named in the charter *Terra Mariæ*,—Mary's Land,—in honor of the Queen Henrietta Maria. In 1635 the first legislative assembly was organized, composed of one house; but, in 1639, was divided into two branches, or rather species of representation, namely, burgesses elected by the people, and the other called by special writ. When convened, they sat in one chamber. In 1650 the legislature was divided into two houses. On the death of Charles I., the Puritans of Maryland insisted upon an immediate recognition of the Commonwealth. The authorities, however, representing the Lord Proprietary, proclaimed Charles II. the rightful sovereign of England. But the Puritans

had a majority in the assembly. In 1652 commissioners from England visited Maryland, removed Gov. Stone, the representative of Lord Baltimore, and completely established the authority of the Commonwealth. In 1654-5, Lord Baltimore made repeated efforts to restore the proprietary government. After three years of civil commotion, during the most of which time the Puritan party governed the colony, the power of the proprietary was restored.

In 1660, twenty-six years from the foundation of the colony, the population of Maryland was 12,000, in 1665, 16,000; and in 1671 it had increased to 20,000.

At the time of the Revolution in England, 1688, the government, by the desire of the Puritans, was assumed by King William; and, in 1691, Sir Lionel Copley was appointed governor. In 1715 the government was restored to the family of the proprietary, having been administered by the governors holding under the king's appointment twenty-four years. At this period the population was estimated at 40,000. The prosperity of Maryland was checked by the almost exclusive occupation of the farmers

amply compensated by studying its particular history.¹ The intolerance of Virginia gave birth to Maryland.² The charter recognized a representative

and planters in raising tobacco, to the neglect of more important crops for food. In 1694 and 1695 a destructive disease broke out among the stock of the farmers, and 25,429 cattle and 62,875 hogs perished.

In 1714 Charles Lord Baltimore, the hereditary proprietary, died at the age of eighty-four. His son, Benedict Leonard Calvert, succeeded, but lived only long enough to have his rights acknowledged. He died in April, 1715. The principal obstacle to the recognition of the claim of this family was now removed; for the complaints on which it had been deprived of the government in 1691 were, many of them, founded in the fact that the proprietary was a Papist, and the young heir, upon whom the titles and possessions of the Lords Baltimore devolved, had been educated a Protestant. In 1715, therefore, the authority of the proprietary was restored. From this period until the breaking out of the French War, in 1758, the history of Maryland is not marked by any great event. Its local annals are filled with relations of the disputes and contentions which took place between the proprietary and the people; the one struggling to maintain or extend his hereditary and prescriptive privileges, and the other to establish their liberties, to confirm their ancient rights, or to acquire new ones. In all these struggles are discernible the germs of the revolution of 1776.— See *History and Statistics of Maryland*, by J. C. G. Kennedy, *Sup. of the Census*.

¹ Read Bancroft, Chalmers, Bozman, Hildreth, Kennedy's Discourse on the Life and Character of George Calvert, &c.; Streeter's Discourse, "Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago." 1852.

² In 1621 Sir George Calvert obtained a grant from King James of that part of the island of Newfoundland which lies between the Bay of Bulls on the east coast thereof, and Cape St. Mary's on the south, which was erected into a province, and called Avalon. Here he commenced a settlement,

erected granaries and store-houses, and in 1622 set up a salt-work. In 1625 he visited in person the colony. A residence there soon satisfied him that the country was not eligible for colonization. He expended on this settlement twenty-five thousand pounds. As he doubtless had received full information in regard to the colony of Virginia, and favorable accounts of the climate and soil of the country bordering on Chesapeake, he was induced, in 1628, to visit that colony in search of some more desirable situation. Whether a jealousy of his colonial views, or those general prejudices against the Papists, which were now more prevalent than ever, even in the mother country, operated with the Virginians, his visit was received by them most ungraciously. What renders this reception of him somewhat more surprising is, that the colonists of Virginia had not emigrated from England to evade religious persecution. The Church of England was then the established religion in Virginia, and Puritanism had not been hitherto encouraged among them. It is true that those in England who were denominated high churchman, as Archbishop Laud and others, were accused by the Puritans of being inclined to Popery; but it is to be remembered that Charles professed to be alike opposed to Popery and Puritanism.

Immediately on the arrival of Lord Baltimore in Virginia, the assembly of that province caused the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to be tendered to him and his followers. He rejected them; proposing, however, at the same time, a form of oath which he declared himself ready to accept. As these oaths were prescribed by particular statutes, it was not in the power of the assembly to dispense with them after being tendered. In this state matters rested, the assembly contenting itself with laying the whole transaction before the privy council in England.

This incident would seem to show that the assembly did not look upon Lord Balti-

government,¹ and conceded popular liberty and religious freedom. Sir

more in the light of a mere casual visitor. They subjected him to what amounted almost to an indignity, in requiring him to take the oaths, who had been secretary of state, who was one of their own patentees in the London Company, and who was a public-spirited nobleman, somewhat distinguished for his enterprise in the cause of colonization; who, in addition to all this, was on the best terms with the reigning sovereign at home. He very soon afterwards departed from the James river, to pursue a much more agreeable voyage up the Chesapeake. Under these circumstances he entered the Potomac, examined the country upon its left bank, and projected the settlement of Maryland.—See *Bozman*, p. 281, *Historical Discourse of Kennedy*, 19, 20.

A more recent author alludes to the arrival and reception of Lord Baltimore in Virginia, with a different judgment. He says:

“The arrival of a visitor so distinguished caused some excitement at James City; and the authorities inquired why he, the governor of another colony, had abandoned that and come to theirs. ‘To seek a plantation and a dwelling-place among you,’ was his lordship’s reply. ‘Very willingly,’ answered they, ‘provided you will take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, as we have done, and which we are obliged, by the royal order, to exact from every person who becomes a member of this colony.’ A modified form of the oath was proposed by him, as one which his obligations as a Catholic would allow him to take; but the governor and council, moved, without doubt, by that jealousy of Catholicism which was felt by the colonists, as well as by the people of the mother country (though professing to act solely upon the royal instructions), declined to admit into their community a man, however distinguished, ‘who was unwilling to acknowledge all the eminenes belonging to his majesty,’ and prayed him to make provision to depart from the colony by the next ship that sailed for England. He complied with their

request; but not before he had examined the broad bay of ‘Chesapiack,’ the islands that stud its surface, the beautiful rivers which flow into it, especially from the west, and the rich, inviting country, which, almost without an inhabitant, except a few savage tribes, spread out upon its borders.

“From this remark must be excepted, however, a large island in the bay, on which Capt. William Clayborne, a member of the Council of Virginia, and a man of great energy and untiring enterprise, had established a trading settlement, and to which he had given the name of Kent; as also an island in the mouth of the Susquehanna river, on which he had placed an advance post to facilitate his trading operations,—both of which he had purchased of the native chiefs, besides taking up lands upon each, according to the custom of the country at that period.

“Leaving his lady and servants behind, Lord Baltimore proceeded to England, hoping that, by personal appeal, the king might be induced to relax in his favor the regulation in regard to emigrants in Virginia, and accept of a modified form of oath; but he was disappointed. His application was ineffectual, and he found himself under the necessity of fitting out a vessel (February, 1680), and sending her to Virginia, to convey his lady and servants to England.”—*Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, by S. F. Streeter, p. 11, 12.

¹ Although Charles I. had, but a few years before he granted the charter of Maryland to Lord Baltimore, dissolved his Parliament, and had at that time formed the resolution, as some historians allege, of never calling another, and of governing without them, yet a very strong provision is to be found in that instrument for a free government,—a representative legislature. See the 7th section. But in the 8th section a clause is inserted which, by a latitude of construction, might be interpreted to give powers repugnant to the conditions of the preceding section.—See *Bozman*, Vol. 1, p. 289.

George Calvert¹ was a Catholic, a statesman of comprehensive views, and versed in the changing motives of men and of governments. He anticipated the claims of prerogative and of freedom, and endeavored to provide for them in advance. Actuated by the Christian spirit of disarming the Protestant by concession, he was tolerant in his plans, and liberal in his views of policy. His theory for a government in America was in advance of his own expressed views and practice at home.² He secured from his royal master the recognition of Democracy without pledging himself to its principles, and framed a government which, while it promised freedom to

¹ According to Anthony Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, Calvert was born in 1582, at Kipling, in the Chapelry of Bolton, in Yorkshire, and was the son of Leonard Calvert and Alice, daughter of John Crossland. Some date his birth in the year 1580. The family of Calvert is said to be descended from an ancient and noble house of that name in the Earldom of Flanders, whence they were transplanted into the northern parts of England. The family was one of wealth. In 1597 Calvert took a Bachelor's degree at Oxford, and then visited the continent of Europe to complete his studies. Sir Robert Cecil, the Lord Treasurer, afterwards Earl of Salisbury, early became his friend. About the year 1604-5, he married Anne, the daughter of George Mynne, of Hertfordshire, and grand-daughter of Sir Thomas Wroth, of Durance, in Enfield, Middlesex. His eldest son, born in 1606, was named for his distinguished friend, Sir Robert Cecil. About the year 1606 he was appointed private secretary to the prime minister, an office which he held for several years. In 1609 his name appears as one of the patentees in the new charter which was then given to the company for planting Virginia; and, in 1620, it is again enumerated in Captain Smith's list of members.

The Earl of Salisbury died in 1612; after which event Calvert seems to have enjoyed a liberal share of the favor and regard of King James, who, in 1617, promoted him to the post of clerk of the privy council, and invested him with the honor of knighthood. In 1619 he was appointed principal secretary of state, which place he held until 1624, when he resigned it, according to Fuller,

for the following reason: "He freely confessed himself to the king that he was then become a Roman Catholic, so that he must be wanting to his trust, or violate his conscience, in discharging his office. This, his ingenuity," adds Fuller, "so highly affected King James, that he continued him privy councillor, all his reign, as appeareth in his council-books, and soon after created him Lord Baltimore, of Baltimore in Ireland." Chalmers says he was officially one of the committee of council for the affairs of the plantations.—See *Kennedy's Discourse*.

² In politics Sir George Calvert was of the court party (in the reigns of James I. and Charles I.), opposed to the country party,—designations which were changed in the reign of Charles II. to Tory and Whig. As one of this party, he was the advocate of the high kingly prerogative, as contradistinguished from the privilege of the legislative body,—a champion of executive power against the power of Parliament. Graham says of him, that "he was a strenuous assertor of the supremacy of that authority from the exercise of which he expected to derive his own enrichment." "And, as principal manager of the interest of the court," says Chalmers, "we have heard him opposing the bill for a free fishing, because supposed contrary to the royal authority; and insisting, with that confidence which conviction always inspires, that the American territory, being gotten by conquest, ought to be governed by prerogative as the king pleases."—*Book*, VOL. I, p. 201. See *Kennedy's Hist. Discourse*, p. 22.

the people, reserved the power of control to its officers.¹ But he was not destined to witness the results of a charter which authorized a freedom so independent of the crown. He died "before a patent could be finally adjusted and pass the seals," and his son, Cecil Calvert, succeeded to his honors and fortunes.²

"Whatever were the real causes," says Chalmers, "which procured this remarkable grant, the ostensible motives were declared to be 'a laudable zeal for extending the Christian religion and the territories of the empire.' The son was heir of his father's intentions, as well as fortunes; and in June, 1632, the charter of Maryland was confirmed by the king, and Cecil was created absolute proprietary, saving the allegiance and sovereign dominion due to the crown. He was empowered, with assent of the freemen, or their delegates, whom he was required to assemble for that purpose, to make laws of what kind soever for the province, 'so that they be not repugnant but agreeable to the jurisprudence and rights of the realm of England.' He was the authorized executive of the assembly. Power was given to the proprietary, with the assent of the people, to impose subsidies there, upon just cause and in due proportion, which were granted to him forever: and there was a covenant on the part of Charles, that neither he nor his successors should at any time impose, or cause to be imposed, any tallages on the colonists, or their goods and tenements, or on their commodities, to be laden within the province. Thus was conferred on Maryland that exemption forever, which had been granted to other colonies for years. This region was erected into a palatinate, and the proprietary was invested with all the royal rights of the palace, as fully as any Bishop of Durham had ever enjoyed." He was authorized to appoint officers, repel invasions, suppress rebellions, and to erect forts; but with an express saving of that right, which the commons had so long contended for, of fishing within the various bays, harbors and creeks, of the province. And, what appeared to be an act of extraordinary condescension on the part of his majesty, the charter finally provided that, should any doubts arise concerning the true meaning of it, such an interpretation should be made which most favored the proprietary, and was not inconsistent with allegiance due to the crown, or the demands of the Christian religion. There was no condition in the charter which required "the proprietary to transmit the acts of the assembly to the king, for approbation or dissent;" nor any saving of the royal interference in the government of the province. These essential omissions induced the commissioners of plantations to represent to the commons, in 1733, "that Maryland is under no obligation, by its constitution, to return authentic copies of its laws to the sovereign for confirmation, or disallowance; or to give any account of its proceedings." "Nothing can afford more decisive

¹ Chalmers, p. 201.

² Bancroft, Vol. I, p. 245.

proof," continues Chalmers, "that these material omissions, that Sir George Calvert was the chief penman of the grant. For the rights of the proprietary were carefully attended to, but the prerogatives of the crown and the rights of the nation were in a great measure overlooked or forgotten."¹

For some reason unknown, Lord Baltimore abandoned his purpose of conducting the emigrants in person, and appointed his brother, Leonard Calvert, to act as his lieutenant.² On the 22d of November, 1633,³ the lieutenant, and about two hundred gentlemen of considerable fortune and rank,⁴ sailed from England in the ship *Ark*, and in a Pinnance, *Dove*, for the Potomac, where they arrived, February 24, 1634, at Point Comfort, in Virginia; and where, in obedience to the express letters of King Charles, they were welcomed by Gov. Harvey, of Virginia, with courtesy and humanity.⁵

Animated by a just sense towards the aborigines, he secured their favor by respecting their rights, and purchased of them a territory which they were already preparing to leave.⁶ "The Indian women," says Bancroft, "taught the wives of the new comers to make bread of maize. The warriors of the tribe instructed the huntsmen how rich were the forests of America in game, and joined them in the chase. And, as the season of the year invited to the pursuits of agriculture, and the English had come into possession of ground already subdued, they were able at once to possess corn-fields and gardens, and prepare the wealth of successful husbandry. Virginia, from its surplus produce, could furnish a temporary supply of food, and all kinds of domestic cattle. No sufferings were endured; no fears of want were excited. The foundation of the colony of Maryland was peacefully and happily laid. Within six months it had advanced more than Virginia had done in as many years. The proprietary continued, with great liberality, to provide everything that was necessary for its comfort and protection, and spared no cost to promote its interests,—expending, in the first two years, upwards of forty thousand pounds sterling. But far more memorable was the character of the Maryland institutions. Every other country in the world had persecuting laws. 'I will not,'—such was the oath for the Governor of Maryland,—'I will not, by myself or any other, directly or indirectly molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for or in respect of religion.'"⁷

It is remarked by Kennedy⁸ that "the glory of Maryland toleration is in

¹ Political Annals, p. 203.

² Bancroft, Vol. I, p. 245.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Chalmers, p. 207.

⁵ Bancroft, Vol. I, p. 246.

⁶ The native inhabitants, having suffered from the superior power of the Susquehannas, who occupied the district between the

bays, had already resolved to remove into places of more security in the interior, and many of them had begun to migrate before the English arrived.—*Ibid*, Vol. I, p. 246.

⁷ Vol. I, p. 248.

⁸ Discourse on Life and Character of George Calvert, &c., p. 42.

the charter, not in the act of 1649. In settling the colony under this charter, it is true that Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, gathered the colonists chiefly from the Roman Catholics. It was quite natural that, in making up his first adventure, the proprietary should have gone amongst his friends and kinsmen, and solicited their aid in his enterprise. It is to their credit that they joined him in it; and much more to their credit that they faithfully administered the charter, by opening the door of emigration to all Christians, with an assurance of equal rights and privilege."¹ "This happy enterprise," continues the same author, "could not have succeeded under any other circumstances than those which existed. If Charles had been a Catholic prince, a Catholic proprietary would have procured a charter for the establishment of a Catholic province. If Calvert had been a Protestant nobleman, a Protestant prince would have granted him a charter for a Protestant province. In either case it would have been proscriptive. Both of these predicaments were abundantly exemplified in the history of that period. Exclusiveness, intolerance, persecution of opposing sects, were the invariable characteristics of early American colonization. It was to the rare and happy coincidence of a wise, moderate and energetic Catholic statesman asking and receiving a charter from a Protestant monarch, jealous of the faith, but full of honorable confidence in the integrity of his servant, that we owe this luminous and beautiful exception of Maryland to the spirit of the colonization of the seventeenth century."

But, with every disposition to favor the motives of Lord Baltimore, it must be admitted that there is much reason for believing that the king's confidence was based upon his lordship's well-known devotion to his majesty's service, and that neither he nor the king was disposed to trust the people in the exercise of an independent judgment. They could well afford to trust the people, if the people would but first place entire confidence in them; and they could safely propose Democratic institutions, provided those institutions were to be governed by laws of their own proposing. It is but just that they should be commended for their confidence in Democracy; but it cannot be disguised that, while they had no misgivings in respect to their own liability to err, they had but little faith in the executive judgment of others.

The very beginning of the government affords a key to the motives of both parties.² The liberality of the charter warranted the expectation of a free-

¹ Lord Baltimore invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to emigrate to Maryland, offering them lands and privileges, and "free liberty of religion;" but Gibbons, to whom he had forwarded a commission, was "so wholly tutored in the New England discipline," that he would not advance the wishes of the Irish peer;—and the people, who subsequently refused Jamaica and Ireland, were not now tempted to desert the Bay of Massachusetts for the Chesapeake.—*Bancroft*, Vol. I, p. 253.

² In 1638, when it was proposed in the assembly to consider again the laws sent by

dom consistent with the dignity of self-government; and, when the people assembled to express their wishes and to act the part of legislators, they were met by a paternal policy, and opposed by the conservative wisdom of an aristocracy. The proprietary began by assuming that he could better provide for their wants than they could provide for themselves; and, when he asked their assent to laws which he had framed for their adoption, he doubtless supposed that while he flattered their hopes by an agreement in princi-

the Lord Proprietor, three questions appear to have been stated. "1st. Whether the laws should now be read again in the house; or, 2d. Whether they should be put to the vote immediately, without further reading; or, 3d. Whether the subject should not be postponed to a future day, when a greater number of members might attend." On the question, "whether they should be received as laws, or not," the president, and Mr. Lewger (the secretary), "who counted by proxies fourteen voices," voted in the affirmative. All the rest of the assembly voted in the negative, "being thirty-seven voices," including probably their proxies.

"The grounds and reasons of their objections to these laws," says Bozman, "do not appear on the journal; but certain it is that a very warm opposition, among a large majority of the freemen, was made to their reception. Neither are we able, at this day, to judge of the merit or demerit of those laws sent in by the proprietor, by a perusal of them, as no copies of them are to be found on our records. Did the duty of the historian allow him to mention his conjectures, a plausible supposition might be made, that the dispute about the reception of these laws was dictated more by a political contest for the right of propounding laws to be enacted by the assembly than any other cause. We may suppose, on the other hand, also, that his rejection of the laws said to have been made by the colonists in 1635 was founded on this disputable right."—VOL. I, 811, 812, 813.

In illustration of this early contest between the Lord Baltimore and his colonists, relative to the right of propounding laws for the assembly to enact, it may be observed that about the same time (1634) a dispute, somewhat similar to it, took place between

the Lord Deputy of Ireland and the Irish House of Lords. It will appear, perhaps, a little extraordinary to Americans (in the present state of their political sentiments) when they are informed that an Irish statute, made in the 10th Henry 7th, commonly called Sir Edward Poyning's law, was enacted (as the statute expresses it) "at the request of the commons of the land of Ireland;" and was, during the 16th and 17th centuries, considered by the people of Ireland as the Irish Magna Charta, by which "no parliament was to be holden thereafter in the said land, but at such season as the king's lieutenant and council there first do certify the king, under the great seal of that land, the causes, and considerations, and all such acts, as to them seemeth should pass in the same Parliament, and such causes, considerations and acts, affirmed by the king and his council (in England), and his license thereupon, as well in affirmation of the said causes and acts as to summon the said Parliament, had and obtained." The Irish House of Peers contended (1634) that, being the king's hereditary council, they could originate statutes to be sent to England for the king's approbation, according to the statute; but Lord Wentworth (the then lord lieutenant of Ireland) protested against the proposition. And, indeed, the words of the statute seem clearly to have justified his idea.—(See *Leland's History of Ireland*, VOL. II, p. 108, and the *Appendix thereto*, VOL. III, p. 20; also 4 *Inst.*, 352.) Thus Lord Baltimore, an Irish peer, might have been led to construe his charter, like Poyning's law, vesting him with the prerogative of first propounding to the assembly such laws as were to be enacted; but, whether he ever meant to contend for such a preroga-

ples, they would not be reluctant in sanctioning his plans by which those principles were to be reduced to practice.¹

That Catholics should participate in the colonizing spirit of the age, and desire to establish communities in the new country favorable to the Church of Rome, was perfectly natural and reasonable. To succeed in such an undertaking required careful study. Not so much in deciding upon the best plan, as in finding out the only one of a practicable nature that could be executed. The identity of Catholicism was surrendered on the altar of toleration, and Papists were trusted by Protestants because Protestants were favored by Papists.² But this was not all. The jealousy of the people was

tive or not, it is certain that the Assembly, after this session of 1637-8, ever afterwards exerted the right of framing their own laws, to be subsequently approved and assented to by the Lord Proprietor.—*Bozman*, Vol. 1, p. 382, note.

¹ "In the early history of the United States," says Bancroft, "nothing is more remarkable than the uniform attachment of each colony to its franchises; and popular assemblies burst everywhere into life with a consciousness of their importance, and an immediate capacity for efficient legislation. The first assembly of Maryland had vindicated the jurisdiction of the colony; the second had asserted its claims to original legislation; the third, which was now convened (1639), examined its obligations. And, though not all its acts were carried through the forms essential to their validity, it yet displayed the spirit of the people and the times, by framing a declaration of rights."—Vol. 1, p. 250.

² "A close survey of the tendency of political affairs, and the state of religious feeling in England and in his province, now determined the proprietary to change his colonial policy, and to transfer the government of Maryland from the hands of the Catholics, who had held it since the first settlement, to those of Protestants. Accordingly, in the summer of 1648 (June 20th) he set his seal to new conditions of plantation, in which he asserted the restrictive clause, concerning religious fraternities, that the fathers had successfully opposed, six years before. These were followed by a commission (August, 1648) appointing to the government of Maryland Captain William

Stone, a Protestant and a gentleman of standing, who had for some years been high sheriff of Southampton county, in Virginia, and who had recently contracted to introduce five hundred settlers, of English or Irish descent, into the province. The commission to Governor Stone and the accompanying papers are remarkable, as indicating the first steps of Lord Baltimore in a system of politic deference to the prevailing religious and political opinions of the times, an entire remodelling of the laws, and a legislative recognition of the principles of toleration previously practised in the colony, and then upheld by the Independents alone in England, but not even by them extended to the Roman Catholics.

"The honor of originating this measure has long been the subject of controversy, and claimed alike by Catholics and Protestants. By the former, on the ground that the instructions and laws which embodied that divine principle emanated from Lord Baltimore; by the latter, because the laws were enacted by a Protestant Assembly, over whom and whose constituents they were to be enforced. My investigations into the origin of these laws have convinced me that they originated, primarily, neither with Lord Baltimore nor the Assembly; that their provisions sprang from no congenial principles at that day active in either the Catholic or Protestant divisions of the church; that they were drawn up in deference to the progressive doctrines and increasing political strength of the Independents in England, as well as to meet the wants of the mixed population of the province; and their adoption was an act prompted

to be quieted by proposing to them a greater liberty than any one had asked ; and their confidence and affection were to be secured by a constant and faithful oversight in regard to their true interests, more than they had been accustomed to see. Such appears to have been the enlightened policy of Lord Baltimore. He gained a victory by surrender, and acquired a confidence by concession ; but his successors were mastered by principles which he endeavored to control, and they were led to the adoption of practices which he honestly endeavored to avoid. As darkness vanishes before the tide of light, so bigotry melts in the presence of truth, and the spirit of oppression is powerless when met by the strong arm of Democracy.

A policy of wisdom is never barren of beneficial results.¹ But, if Lord Baltimore was just in his plans and liberal in his concessions, he failed to make a distinction between motives of benevolence and the influences of public opinion,—between his own dispositions and opinions and the probable views of his successors. Catholics may die, but Papacy remains. Protestantism may sleep, but only to be awakened by new events calculated to encourage activity. Reaction can only come from action. Men are excited to do to-day what yesterday was anticipated by no one ; and what is true of man in this respect, as an individual, is particularly true of communities and of nations. Lord Baltimore reasoned well in regard to his own colony and himself, but badly in respect to the permanent source of his power and the nature of his relations to the other colonies. He failed to quiet claims made by Protestants in a Protestant country. He rested upon a fatal confidence as secure against enemies who never appreciated his motives, but only watched an opportunity to crush him ; and he relied upon a sovereignty which, while it conferred an independence upon others, had not the control of its own.² The sovereignty of Charles I. was diffused in the com-

far less by feelings of religious benevolence than by civil necessity. If this view be correct, neither Catholics nor Protestants, as sects, at the present day, have any especial ground for self-laudation on the subject, nor any reason for attempting to make capital, in opposition to each other, out of what was done by their predecessors in Maryland two hundred years ago.”—*Streeter's Discourse*, p. 39.

This quotation is given that the views of the writer may be known, and not because his reasoning is regarded as entirely conclusive.

¹ “It is a singular fact,” says Bancroft, “that the only proprietary charters productive of considerable emolument to their

owners, were those which conceded popular liberty.—VOL. I, p. 242.

² Charles Calvert, who governed the province from 1661 with a high reputation for virtue and abilities, succeeded his father as proprietary in 1676. He immediately convened an assembly, in which he presided in person. They carefully revised the whole code of laws. They repealed the unnecessary ; they explained the obscure ; they confirmed the salutary. So says Chalmers. Yet, when the proprietary visited England he was saluted with complaint. The Bishop of London represented to the committee of plantations the deplorable state of Maryland with regard to religion ; that, while the Roman Catholic priests were

monwealth. The sovereignty of Charles II. was gathered and compounded by an indignant monarch ; and the elements which had centred in his father, and newly combined in the loose conceptions of the son, were taken with a discriminating hand. The official identity of the Lord Proprietor had been lost in the changes of government, and in the progress of things.¹

Maryland had been settled as if a colony or state could exist and thrive

endowed with valuable lands, the Protestant ministers of the Church of England were utterly destitute of support, whereby immorality reigned triumphant there. Lord Baltimore, in justification of himself and the province, cited the act of 1649 concerning religion, which had been confirmed in the year 1676 as a perpetual law, and which tolerated and protected every sect of Christians, but gave special privileges to none. He asserted that four ministers of the Church of England were in possession of plantations which afforded them a decent subsistence; but that, from the various religious tenets of the members of assembly, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to induce it to consent to a law that should oblige any sect to maintain other ministers than its own. However satisfactory and decisive was this answer, it seems not to have procured perfect acquiescence. The committee declared that they thought fit there should be some maintenance for the clergy of the church. For a season complaints were silenced, but soon again he was accused of "*partiality to Papists*." It was in vain for him to represent that the laws of his province gave equal encouragement to men of every sect, without favoring any; that he had endeavored to divide the offices of his government as nearly equal among Protestants and Roman Catholics as their different abilities would permit; that he had given almost the whole command of the militia to the former, who were intrusted with the care of the arms and military stores. The ministers of Charles II., to throw the imputation of Popery from their own shoulders, commanded "that all offices should be put into Protestant hands." Lord Baltimore was accused of obstructing the custom-house officers in the collection of parliamentary duties. Charles II. com-

plained bitterly that he should obstruct his service, and discourage the officers of the customs in the execution of their duty, after the many favors which had been heaped upon him and his father. In 1689 an association in arms was formed for the defence of the Protestant religion, and for asserting the right of King William and Queen Mary to that province and all the English dominions. John Coode was placed at the head of this association. The king transmitted orders to those who had thus acquired power, to exercise it in his name for the preservation of peace.—See *Chalmers' Annals*, p. 364-374.

¹ "When the throne and the peerage," says Bancroft, "had been subverted in England, it might be questioned whether the mimic monarchy of Lord Baltimore should be permitted to continue. When hereditary power had ceased in the mother country, might it properly exist in the colony? It seemed uncertain if the proprietary could maintain his position; and the scrupulous Puritans hesitated to take an unqualified oath of fealty, with which they might be unable to comply. Englishmen were no longer lieges of a sovereign, but members of a commonwealth (1650); and, but for the claims of Baltimore, Maryland would equally enjoy the benefits of republican liberty. Great as was the temptation to assert independence, it would not have prevailed, could the peace of the province have been maintained. But who, it might well be asked, was the sovereign of Maryland? Her "beauty and extraordinary goodness" had been to her a fatal dowry; and Maryland was claimed by four separate aspirants. Virginia was ever ready to revive its rights to jurisdiction beyond the Potomac, and Olaybourne had already excited attention by his persevering opposi-

without adapting itself to external and surrounding conditions. It stood upon a basis too narrow for a continental policy, and relied upon theories too partial for humanity. It was checked by the pressure of party principles external to itself, and what existed in harmony with the spirit of the land was saved, fostered, and sustained. Maryland became subject to Protestant control, and preserved to the last, through struggles incident to subserviency, those democratic features of government which were established by its founder, and which prepared the way for a union favorable to independence. It was with a lively sense of the great truths of Democracy that Lord Baltimore proposed so broad a basis for the government of Maryland, although he could hardly understand in what way it was to be administered without a conservative control. As a Papist, he could see a nation without a Pope,¹ as a lord he could see a people without a nobility; but as a man, he was not practi-

tion. Charles II., incensed against Lord Baltimore for his adhesion to the rebels and his toleration of schismatics, had issued a commission to Sir William Davenant. Stone was the active deputy of Lord Baltimore, and Parliament and already appointed its commissioners.—VOL. I, pp. 258-259.

¹ A proclamation had been issued by Leonard Calvert, the governor, in 1638, to prohibit all unseasonable disputations in point of religion, tending to the disturbance of the public peace and quiet of the colony, and to "*the opening of faction in religion.*" Captain Cornwaleys, a Catholic gentleman, one of the most distinguished and authoritative persons in the province, had two Protestant servants, by the name of Gray and Sedgrave. These two chanced to be reading aloud together Smith's sermons, a Protestant book, and were overheard by William Lewis, an overseer in the employment of Cornwaleys. Lewis was a zealous Catholic; and it happened that the servants, when overheard by him, were reading a passage to which he took great exception. It charged the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Jesuits to be anti-christian ministers. Lewis, it seems, supposed this was read aloud to vex him; whereupon, getting into a passion, he told them "that it was a falsehood, and came from the devil, as all lies did: and that he that writ it was an instrument of the devil, and he would prove it; and that all Protestant ministers were

the ministers of the devil;"—and he forbade them reading more.

Without going further into the particulars, it will be sufficient to relate that the two servants prepared a formal complaint against the overseer, to be submitted to the governor and council; that Captain Cornwaleys himself gave the case another direction, by sending it into court, of which Governor Calvert, Cornwaleys, and Mr. Lewger, the Secretary of Province, were the members; that this court summoned all the parties before it, heard the whole case, and fined Lewis five hundred pounds of tobacco, and ordered him to remain in prison until he should find sureties for his good behavior in future.—See *Bozman*.

In commenting upon this anecdote, Kennedy says that "it very strikingly displays the patriarchal character of the government, and its extreme solicitude to keep all religious bickerings and discontents out of the province." It must be considered, however, that "extreme solicitude" may arise from different and opposite motives. Calvert could not have been indifferent to the fact that his settlement was in a Protestant country, and favored by a Protestant king. His *solicitude* would naturally spring rather from his sense of *weakness*, than from any want of disposition to favor his own religion, provided he had the necessary power.—See *Kennedy's Hist. Discourse*, p. 44.

ally prepared to comprehend either the dignity of his nature, or the justice of equal rights. Catholicism and Protestantism joined hands with a conciliatory spirit on the continent, and Papacy became identified with Democracy in America.

But the principles of Democracy remained to be still further illustrated by a Quaker, in the settlement of Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA.¹

Sectarian zeal had had its seasons of contest, and intolerance its victims, and war its desolations. Religion in its benignity, and patriotism in its lofty aims, had blessed the continent with examples of mutual forbearance and exalted freedom. It now remained for the spirit of peace, in its "modest stillness and humility," to exert its sway in a sovereignty of brotherly love. William Penn desired "all good men's love," as afterwards James Oglethorpe commanded all good men's charity.

William Penn² was better prepared than Lord Baltimore could have been

¹ Pennsylvania was originally settled by different detachments of planters under various authorities, Dutch, Swedes and others, which at different times occupied portions of land on South or Delaware river. The ascendancy was finally obtained over these settlements by the Governors of New York, acting under the charter of 1664, to the Duke of York.

It continued in a feeble state until William Penn, in March, 1681, obtained a patent from Charles II., by which he became proprietary of an ample territory, which, in honor of his father, was called Pennsylvania. The boundaries described in the charter were on the east by Delaware river from twelve miles distance northwards of Newcastle town, to the forty-third degree of north latitude, if the said river doth extend so far northward; but if not, then the said river so far as it doth extend; and, from the head of the river, the eastern bounds are to be determined by a meridian line to be drawn from the head of said river unto the said forty-third degree of north latitude. The said lands to extend westward five degrees in longitude, to be computed from the said eastern bounds, and the said lands to be bounded on the north by the beginning

of the forty-third degree of north latitude; and on the south by a circle drawn at twelve miles distance from Newcastle, northward and westward, to the beginning of the fortieth degree of northern latitude; and then by a straight line westward to the limits of the longitude above mentioned. "This impossible boundary," says Bancroft, "received the assent of the agents of the Duke of York and Lord Baltimore."

A new frame of government was, with the consent of the General Assembly, established in 1683. In 1692 Penn was deprived of the government of Pennsylvania by William and Mary, but it was again restored to him the succeeding year. A third frame of government was established in 1696. This again was surrendered, and a new final charter of government was, in October, 1701, with the consent of the General Assembly, established, under which the province continued to be governed down to the period of the American Revolution.—See *Story's Commentaries*.

² William Penn was descended from an ancient family, of the same name, in the fifteenth century, at the village of Penn, in Buckinghamshire, England. Further traces of this family are to be found in *Penlands*,

to provide a more perfect system of government, having observed and studied the experience of colonies already established. It is true he was but little

Penn-street, Penn-house, Penwood, all of them the names of places in the same county. From William Penn, at Penn's Lodge, who died March 12, 1591, comes Giles Penn. Giles, it is known, was a captain in the royal navy. He was, also, for some time, English consul in the Mediterranean. He had a son William, born in 1621, who entered the navy and became a distinguished officer. He commanded, at a very early age, the fleet which Oliver Cromwell sent against Hispaniola. After the restoration of Charles II., he was commander under the Duke of York in that great and terrible sea-fight against the Dutch, under Admiral Opdam, in the year 1665, where he contributed so much to the victory, that he was knighted. He was ever afterwards received with all the marks of private friendship at court. The following extract is taken from an inscription which is to be seen on his monument, erected by his wife, in Radcliffe church, in the city of Bristol:

He was made captain at the years of twenty-one, rear admiral of Ireland at twenty-three, vice-admiral of Ireland at twenty-five, admiral to the Straights at twenty-nine, vice-admiral of England at thirty-one, and general in the first Dutch war at thirty-two; whence returning anno 1655, he was Parliament man for the town of Weymouth; 1660 made commissioner of the admiralty and navy, governor of the town and fort of Kingsale, vice-admiral of Munster, and a member of that provincial council; and anno 1664 was chosen great captain commander under his royal highness in that signal and most evidently successful fight against the Dutch fleet." He died at Wanstead, in the county of Essex, September 16, 1670, aged forty-nine years. He married Margaret, the daughter of John Jasper, a merchant of Rotterdam, in Holland; and they had one son, William, who was born in London, in the parish of St. Catharine, on Tower Hill, October 14, 1644.

The admiral, trained only to the arts of war, has been more distinguished in the annals of history as the father of the Quaker than as the "great captain" in the fleet of his sovereign,—more known as the ancestor of a democrat than as a knight of royalty, or friend at court. It is not a little remarkable that one who so early and constantly employed himself in the strifes of battle should be parent to a son who, from his days of youth to the end of his life, opposed all war, and favored no policy but that of peace.

The son was sent to Christ's Church College, Oxford, when he had arrived at the age of fifteen years; and he early distinguished himself by his great attention to the college exercises, and by his aversion to show and ceremony. When Charles II. ordered that the surplice should be worn by the students, according to the custom of ancient times, young Penn was so opposed to the execution of the order that he, with his friend Spencer (afterwards the Earl of Sunderland), and some others, combined and fell upon those students who appeared in surplices, and tore them everywhere over their heads. For this outrage, he and several of his associates were expelled.

His father could not be otherwise than displeased with his son's conduct, although he was more troubled with his inclination to associate with religious people, and avoid fashionable life. The admiral was fearful that his son would not be fitted to fill that station in life which was before him. He was prompted by feelings of parental pride to save him from the disgrace of being *religious* in any way but that prescribed by the church. He had recourse to argument. This failing, he proceeded to blows. Meeting with no success by blows, he turned him out of doors. Passion had mastered the parent. The parent relented,—the son was forgiven. He was then (1662) sent to Paris. It was supposed that French manners might correct the growing gravity of

influenced by others, except to manifest an earnest desire to avoid their errors ; and, as these were more studied in their results than in their causes, he as

his mind. While there, it is related of him, that he was attacked one evening in the street by a person who drew his sword upon him in consequence of a supposed affront. A conflict ensued. William disarmed his antagonist, but proceeded no further, sparing his life when he could have taken it. He remained in Paris a short time, but soon left for Saumur, whither he went to avail himself of the conversation and instruction of the learned Moses Amyrault, a Protestant minister of the Calvinistic denomination, and Professor of Divinity at Saumur. Amyrault was highly respected both by the Catholic and the Protestant. With this learned divine he read the fathers, studied theology and the French language. As he was about to visit Italy he received a letter from his father, desiring him to return home, to take care of his affairs during his absence in the war against the Dutch. On his return, on the suggestion of his father, he became a student of Lincoln's Inn, where he remained about a year, until he was compelled to leave, on account of the great plague in London. This was in 1665, in which year he became of age.

When he returned from the continent, his father mistook his cheerful temper and polished manners for change of mind. On his return, however, in 1666, he discovered his mistake. William found no pleasure but in the society of religious people. Having flattered himself that he was successful before in changing the habits of his son, he again attempted to subdue him to his wishes. He was now sent to Ireland,—not for instruction so much as diversion. It was supposed that he might be led to dismiss his grave tendencies of mind at the lively court of the Duke of Ormond, who was then Lord Lieutenant. Not so. His father then tried the effects of a business commission. He owned large estates in Ireland, and William was intrusted with the sole management of them, much to his own relief and the satisfaction of the father.

Still, he was a Quaker, and attended Quaker meetings. He was arrested at one of these meetings, in 1667, on the plea of a proclamation issued in 1660 against tumultuous assemblies. He was committed to prison, but soon released, to return again to his unhappy father. He was now a confirmed Quaker. His father saw it, and told him "that he would trouble him no more on the subject of his conversion, if he would only consent to sit with his hat off in his own presence, and in that of the king and the Duke of York." What terms of surrender for a father to make to an only son! William loved and respected his father, but he could not be induced to favor "hat worship." Only in the service of his Maker could he justify himself in the act of uncovering the head, according to the practice enjoined by St. Paul. The admiral heard his answer, but it enraged him. He again banished his son from his presence; little thinking that, by such an act, he was claiming a position for royalty and himself, in the affections of another, equal to that conceded by the Christian world to the Almighty Ruler of the universe!

In 1668 William became a preacher and a writer. For his writings he was sent to the Tower. He was told by the Bishop of London that he would be imprisoned for life, unless he would renounce his heresies. "My prison shall be my grave," was his independent reply. Stillingfleet was appointed by Charles II. kindly to reason with him. "The Tower is to me the worst argument in the world," was his emphatic message to the king. He was released, but still to be active in aiding his persecuted brethren, and in declaring the truth according to his convictions of duty. He was now (1669) reconciled to his father. In his last days his father was led to admire what he had too often condemned in his son. In 1670 he was again sent to the Tower, and to Newgate, for preaching. He was tried at the Old Bailey, and acquitted.

often failed in rendering his own theories complete as he succeeded in correcting the theories of others. He was a confident believer in fundamental principles, but he did not appear to comprehend the slow conditions of progress. "Things do not change," says he, in a letter to a friend. "Causes and effects are ever the same; and they that seek to over-rule the eternal order fight with the winds, and overthrow themselves." And yet, but few at an early age attempted more, or found less to commend in the wisdom of the past. The consciousness of his own high motives of integrity led him to adopt extravagant views of man's present capability; but his sentiments were in advance of his knowledge, and his philosophy was not kept in harmony with his prayers. It could not be said that he was ignorant of practical life, for few enjoyed superior opportunities as the subject of incident, or as the observer of things. Government in its various forms, administered both by its official dignitaries and by proxy, became with him an absorbing topic; and his constant intercourse with men of every class of mind, condition and rank, enabled him to become familiar not only with the elements of power to be found in the bosom of society, but with the wants of humanity. He was early tested by parental austerity, and, by his uncompromising spirit of allegiance to his Maker, he frequently became the subject of governmental proscription and oppression. He had position by birth, and opportunities of influence by wealth. He seemed to realize, with unspeakable delight, the sublime truth that "God is love;" and in this universal truth he saw both the duty and destiny of man. With "an inward submission of the soul to the will of God," he earnestly sought to check the inordinate desires of the flesh. Self-denial was his principle of action; and whatever he attempted

During this celebrated trial he appeared with great dignity, asserted his rights with clearness and accuracy, inspired the jury with a confidence that was authorized by *Magna Charta*, and put to shame the judges who sought only to deprive him of his liberty without reference to law. (See some account of this trial in *Clarkson's Penn*, Vol. I, p. 58; *Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 371.

In 1671, while in Newgate, he actively employed his pen in behalf of the cause of freedom. When liberated from prison, he travelled into Holland and Germany, to spread his religious views. He returned to England in 1672. He now entered into the married state. He took for his wife *Gulielma Maria Springett*, daughter of *Sir William Springett*, of *Darling*, in *Sussex*. She was esteemed a woman of extraordinary

worth and beauty. From this period to 1676, when he first takes an interest in the colonial affairs of America, and to 1680, when he plans the colony of Pennsylvania, he spent most of his time in travelling, preaching, and writing. His writings were on religious and national topics; and they discover much mental activity, much research, and a spirit of great sincerity. As the remainder of his life is briefly given in other portions of this chapter, so far as it is deemed necessary to illustrate the early history of his colony, this note is not extended further than to give the period of his death. In 1718, "after a continued and gradual declension for about six years," he died at *Rushcomb*, July 30th, aged 73 years.—See *Clarkson*.

to do was adjusted to the standard of right, and without regard to consequences. Expediency made no part of his theory in politics, morals, or religion.¹ He gave utterance to his convictions without disguising them, and when he acted he prized more an inward peace than an outward popularity. His excesses were those of benevolence, and to these may be traced most of his errors.

When Penn projected the settlement of Pennsylvania, he was not without some experience in the business of colonization. He had served for several years as a trustee in the management of West New Jersey, and in 1681 he became a joint proprietor of East New Jersey.² Whether he was led to

¹ In his dedication of the *Memoirs of the Life of William Penn* to Lord Holland, Thomas Clarkson denominates him "the first statesman who, banishing political expediency, founded his public conduct solely on the principles of justice, by which he furnished a model of government capable of producing to his own people a superior degree of morality and happiness," &c.

² In 1676 Penn was appointed as an adviser in the colonial concerns of New Jersey. Lord Berkeley, who was joint proprietor of New Jersey, with Sir George Carteret, had, in the preceding year, sold his half-share of it to John Fenwick in trust for Edward Byllinge. A dispute arose between the latter parties, and Penn was appointed arbitrator, and, by means of the most exemplary perseverance, amicably adjusted their differences. He was afterwards induced to become a trustee, and subsequently a joint proprietor.

NEW JERSEY was a part of the territory granted to the Duke of York, and was by him granted in June, 1664, to Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, with all the rights, royalties and powers of government, which he himself possessed. The proprietors, for the better settlement of the territory, agreed in February, 1664-5, upon a constitution or concession of government.

This constitution continued until the province was divided, in 1676, between the proprietors. By that division East New Jersey was assigned to Carteret, and West New Jersey to those who had purchased of

Berkeley. Penn was one of the number. Carteret then explained and confirmed the former concessions for the territory thus exclusively belonging to himself. The proprietors, also, of West Jersey prepared another set of concessions for the settlers within that territory. They contain very ample privileges to the people.

Whether these concessions became the general law of the province seems involved in some obscurity. There were many difficulties and contests for jurisdiction between the governors of the Duke of York and the proprietors of the Jerseys; and these were not settled until after the duke, in 1680, finally surrendered all right to both by letters-patent granted to the respective proprietors. In 1681 the governor of the proprietors of West Jersey, with the consent of the General Assembly, made a frame of government embracing some of the fundamentals in the former concessions. There was to be a Governor and Council, and a General Assembly of representatives of the people. The General Assembly had the power to make laws, to levy taxes, and to appoint officers. Liberty of conscience was allowed, and no persons rendered incapable of office in respect of their faith and worship. West Jersey continued to be governed in this manner until the surrender of the proprietary government, in 1702.

Carteret died in 1679, and, being sole proprietor of East Jersey, by his will he ordered it to be sold for the payment of his debts; and it was accordingly sold to William Penn and eleven others, who were

plan a new colony with a view to a separate control, to test a theory, to gratify a benevolence, "to serve God's truth and people," to civilize the Indians,

called the Twelve Proprietors. The number of proprietors was afterwards increased to twenty-four; and to these the Duke of York, in March, 1682, made his third and last grant of East Jersey. Very serious dissensions soon arose between the two provinces themselves, as well as between them and New York. A *quo warranto* was ordered by the crown, in 1686, to be issued against both provinces. East New Jersey immediately offered to be annexed to West New Jersey, and to submit to a governor to be appointed by the crown. Soon afterwards the crown ordered the Jerseys to be annexed to New England, and the proprietors of East Jersey made a formal surrender of its patent, praying only for a new grant securing the right of soil. Before this request could be granted, the revolution of 1688 took place, and they passed under the allegiance of a new sovereign.

From this period both of these provinces were in a state of great confusion, and remained so until the proprietors of both made a formal surrender of all their powers of government, but not of their lands, to Queen Anne, April, 1702. The queen immediately refuted both provinces into one, and by commission appointed a governor over the same.—See *Story's Commentaries*.

"In New Jersey," says Bancroft, "had the proprietary power been vested in the people, or reserved to one man, it would have survived; but it was divided among speculators in land, who, as a body, had gain, and not freedom, for their end.

"In April, 1688, 'the proprietors of East New Jersey had surrendered their pretended right of government,'* and the surrender had been accepted. In October of the same year the council of the proprietaries, not of the people, of West New Jersey, voted to surrender to the secretary-

general for the dominion of New England 'all records relating to government.' Thus the whole province fell, with New York and New England, under the consolidated government of Andros. At the Revolution, therefore, the sovereignty of New Jersey was merged in the crown; and the leading maxim, soon promulgated by the lords of trade, that the domains of the proprietaries might be bought and sold, but not their executive power, weakened their attempts at the restoration of their authority.

"Will you know with how little government a community of husbandmen may be safe? For twelve years the whole province was not in a settled condition. From June, 1689, to August, 1692, East New Jersey had no government whatever, being, in time of war, without military officers, as well as without magistrates; and afterwards commissions were issued by two sets of proprietors, of which each had its adherents, while a third party, swayed by disgust at the confusion, and also by disputes about land-titles, rejected the proprietaries altogether. In the western moiety, Daniel Coxe, as largest owner of the domain, claimed exclusive proprietary powers; yet the people disallowed his claim, rejecting his deputy, under the bad name of a Jacobite. In 1691 Coxe conveyed such authority as he had to the West Jersey Society; and, in 1692, Andrew Hamilton was accepted in the colony as governor under their commission. Thus did West New Jersey continue, with a short interruption in 1698, till the government was surrendered. But the law officers of the crown questioned even the temporary settlement, and the lords of trade claimed New Jersey as a royal province, and they proposed a settlement of the question by 'a trial in Westminster Hall on a feigned issue.' The proprietaries, threatened with the ultimate interference of Parliament, in

*Smith, 588, 211.

or was moved by all these considerations, it is quite certain that he was actuated by high and disinterested motives in so extensively employing his means for the purchase of territory in the New World. "The views of William Penn," says Proud, "in the colonization of Pennsylvania, were most manifestly the best and most exalted that could occupy the human mind,—namely, to render men as free and happy as the nature of their existence could possibly bear, in their civil capacity; and, in their religious state, to

respect to provinces 'where,' it was said, 'no regular government had ever been established,' resolved rather to resign their pretensions. In the first year of Queen Anne, the surrender took place before the privy council.

"It is worthy of remark, that the domain, ceasing to be connected with proprietary powers, remained, under the rules of private right, safe to its possessors, and was never confiscated. After the Revolution, even to the present time, their rights have been respected like other titles to estates. So true it is that the separation of private property from political questions tends to its security.

"The surrender of 'the pretended' rights to government being completed, the two Jerseys were united in one province; and the government was conferred on Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, who, like Queen Anne, was the grandchild of Clarendon.

"New Jersey never again obtained a charter. The royal commission and the royal instructions to Lord Cornbury constituted the form of its administration. To the governor appointed by the crown belonged the power of legislation, with consent of the royal council and the representatives of the people. A freehold, or property qualification, limited the elective franchise. The governor could convene, prorogue or dissolve the assembly at his will, and the period of its duration depended on his pleasure. The laws were subject to an immediate veto from the governor, and a veto from the crown to be exercised at any time. The governor, with the consent of his council, instituted courts of law, and appointed their officers. The people took no part in constituting the judiciary. Lib-

erty of conscience was granted to all but Papists, but favor was invoked for the Church of England. At the same time, its prosperity was made impossible, by investing the governor with the right of presentation of benefices.

"In suits at law the governor and council formed a court of appeal. If the value in dispute exceeded two hundred pounds, the English privy council possessed ultimate jurisdiction. Two instructions mark, one a declining bigotry, the other an increasing interest. 'Great inconvenience,' says Queen Anne, 'may arise by the liberty of printing in our province' of New Jersey: and therefore no printing-press might be kept,—'no book, pamphlet, or other matters whatsoever, be printed without a license.' And, in conformity with English policy, especial countenance of the traffic 'in merchantable negroes' was earnestly enjoined. Thus the courts, the press, the executive, became dependent on the crown, and the interests of free labor were sacrificed to the cupidity of the Royal African Company.

"One method of influence remained to the people of New Jersey. The assembly must fix the amount of its grants to the governor. The queen did not venture to prescribe, or invite Parliament to prescribe, a salary; still less, herself to concede it from colonial resources. Urgent that all appropriations should be made directly for the use of the crown, to be audited by her officers, she wished a fixed revenue to be settled; but the colonial deliberations were respected, and the wise assembly, which never established a permanent revenue, often embarrassed its votes of supplies by insisting on an auditor of its own.

"The freemen of the colony were soon

restore them to those lost rights and privileges with which God and nature had originally blessed the human race."

At the period when Penn petitioned for land in America, his relations to the crown were peculiar. His father had advanced sums of money, from time to time, for the good of the naval service, and a portion of his salary also remained unpaid. These sums, including interest, now amounted to sixteen thousand pounds. How far he was influenced by considerations connected with these claims, or in what degree the king was moved to favor a petition which would cancel so considerable a debt, does not clearly appear in history. He is recorded as the petitioner for the grant, and as the proposer of conditions to cancel his debt for land, although his majesty Charles II. has the credit of a persisting condescension in naming the province.¹ The petition was opposed, but the charter was granted.² For a considerable

conscious of the diminution of their liberties. For absolute religious freedom, they obtained only toleration; for courts resting on enactments of their own representatives, they now had courts instituted by royal ordinances;—and the sense of their loss quickened their love of freedom by an undefined sentiment of having suffered a wrong. By degrees they claimed to hold their former privileges by the nature of an inviolable compact. The surrender of their charter could change the authority of the proprietaries, but not impair their concessions of political liberties. Inured to self-reliance and self-government, no thought of independence sprung up among them; but the Quakers and Puritans of East and West New Jersey, cordially joining to vindicate their common liberties, never feared an encounter with a royal governor, and were ever alert to resist encroachments on their rights.

"Retaining its own legislature, New Jersey was, for a season, included in the same government with New York. The first governor of West New Jersey had been the peaceful Thomas Olive, who, as a magistrate, had quietly dispensed justice seated on a stump in his fields, and, as a governor, had been content with twenty pounds a year. Did hopes dawn of a brighter day with a kinsman to the queen as governor of the united royal province? In the administration of Olive there had been tranquillity and

contentment,—the happiness of a blameless community under its own guardianship. Would more even justice be administered by one so nearly allied to the nobility and the throne of England?"—VOL. III, p. 46. It may be remarked that such men as Olive cultivated the principles of Democracy; and that royalty, without intending it, rendered them available by placing the province in a position of political activity.

¹ It was the intention of Penn to have had it called New Wales; but the under-secretary, who was a Welshman, opposed it. He then suggested Sylvania, on account of its woods; but they would still prefix Penn to it. He offered the under-secretary twenty guineas to give up his prejudices, and to consent to change the name; for he feared lest it should be looked upon as a vanity in him, and not as a respect in the king, as it truly was, to his father, whom he often mentioned with great praise. Finding that all would not do, he went to the king himself to get the name of Penn struck out, or another substituted; but the king said it was passed, and that he would take the naming of it upon himself.—*Clarkson's Penna*, Vol. I, p. 108.

² William Penn had powerful friends in North, Halifax and Sunderland; and a pledge given to his father on his death-bed obtained for him the assured favor of the Duke of York. Sustained by such friends, and pursuing his object with enthusiasm, he

period the influence of Penn at court was great. Quakerism was a peaceful element. Its dissent was passive,—its activity defensive.

“The moral power of ideas,” says Bancroft,¹ “is constantly effecting changes and improvements in society. No Quaker book has a trace of scepticism on man’s capacity for progress. Such is the force of an honest profession of truth, the humblest person, if single-minded and firm, ‘can shake all the country for ten miles round.’”² The integrity of the inner light is an invincible power. It is a power which never changes. Such was the message of Fox to the Pope, the kings and nobles of all sorts. It fathoms the world, and throws down that which is contrary to it.³ It quenches fire; it daunts wild beasts; it turns aside the edge of the sword; it out-faces instruments of cruelty; it converts executioners. It was remembered with exultation that the enfranchisements of Christianity were the result of faith, and not of the sword; and that truth in its simplicity, radiating from the foot of the cross, has filled a world of sensualists with astonishment, overthrown their altars, discredited their oracles, infused itself into the soul of the multitude, invaded the court, risen superior to armies, and led magistrates and priests, statesmen and generals, in its train, as the trophies of its strength exerted in its freedom.⁴

“Thus the Quaker was cheered by a firm belief in the progress of society. Even Aristotle, so many centuries ago, recognized the upward tendency in human affairs; a Jewish contemporary of Barclay declared that progress to be a tendency towards popular power; George Fox perceived⁵ that the Lord’s hand was against kings; and one day, on the hills of Yorkshire, he had a vision that he was but beginning the glorious work of God in the earth; that his followers would in time become as numerous as motes in the sunbeams; and that the party of humanity would gather the whole human race in one sheep-fold.”⁶ Neither art, wisdom, nor violence, said Barclay,⁷ conscious of the vitality of truth, shall quench the little spark that hath appeared. The atheist,—such was the common opinion of the Quakers,—the atheist alone denies progress, and says in his heart, All things continue as they were in the beginning.⁸

“If, from the rules of private morality, we turn to political institutions, here also the principle of the Quaker is the inner light. He acquiesces in any established government which shall build its laws upon the declarations of ‘universal reason.’”⁹ But government is a part of his religion;¹⁰ and

triumphed over “the great opposition” which he encountered.—*Bancroft*, VOL. II, p. 362.

¹ VOL. II, p. 350.

² Fox, p. 112; Penn, VOL. I, pp. 347, 348.

³ Fox, p. 176.

⁴ Penn, VOL. I, p. 347.

⁵ Fox, p. 175.

⁶ Fox, VOL. XXV.

⁷ Barclay, p. 546.

⁸ Besse, VOL. II, p. 523.

⁹ Penn, VOL. I, p. 202.

¹⁰ Fox, p. 72.

the religion that declares 'every man enlightened by the divine light' establishes government on universal and equal enfranchisement.

" 'Not one of mankind,'¹ says Penn, "is exempted from this illumination.'—'God discovers himself to every man.' He is in every breast,—in the ignorant drudge, as well as in Locke or Leibnitz. Every moral truth² exists in every man's and woman's heart, as an incorruptible seed. The ground may be barren,³ but the seed is certainly there. Every man is a little sovereign to himself.⁴ Freedom is as old as reason itself, which is given to all,⁵ constant and eternal,—the same to all nations.⁶ The Quaker is no materialist.⁷ Truth and conscience are not in the laws of countries; they are not one thing at Rome and another at Athens; they cannot be abrogated by Senate or people.⁸ Freedom and the right of property were in the world before Protestantism.⁹ They came not with Luther; they do not vanish with Calvin. They are the common privilege of mankind.

"The Bible enfranchises those only to whom it is carried; Christianity, those only to whom it is made known; the creed of a sect, those only within its narrow pale. The Quaker, resting his system on the inner light, redeems the race. Of those who believe in the necessity of faith in an outward religion, some have cherished the mild superstition that, in the hour of dissolution,¹⁰ an angel is sent from heaven 'to manifest the doctrine of Christ's passion;' the Quaker believes that the heavenly messenger is always present in the breast of every man, ready to counsel the willing listener.

"Man is equal to his fellow-man. No class can, 'by long apprenticeship' or a prelate's breath, by wearing black or shaving the crown,¹¹ obtain a monopoly of moral truth. There is no distinction of clergy and laity.

"The inner light sheds its blessing on the whole human race. It knows no distinction of sex. It redeems woman by the dignity of her moral nature, and claims for her the equal culture and free exercise of her endowments. As the human race ascends the steep acclivity of improvement, the Quaker cherishes woman as the equal companion of the journey.¹²

"Men are equal.¹³ The Quaker knows no abiding distinction of king and subject. The universality of the inner light 'brings crowns to the dust,¹⁴ and lays them low and level with the earth.' 'The Lord will be king; there will be no crowns but to such as obey his will.' With God a thousand years

¹ Penn, Vol. I, p. 320.

² Penn, Vol. I, p. 323.

³ Barclay, pp. 295, 299.

⁴ Ib. pp. 168, 169.

⁵ Penn, Vol. III, p. 183; Ib. Vol. I, p. 203.

⁶ Barclay, p. 183.

⁷ Penn, Vol. II, p. 552.

⁸ Barclay, p. 183.

⁹ Penn, Vol. I, p. 221; Ib. Vol. II, p. 294; Ib. Vol. I, p. 221.

¹⁰ Barclay, p. 7.

¹¹ Barclay, pp. 309, 310, 311.

¹² Fox, p. 59.

¹³ Barclay, pp. 169, 305, 312.

¹⁴ Fox, p. 175.

are indeed as one day ; yet judgment on tyrants will come at last,¹ and may come ere long.

"Every man has God in the conscience ; the Quaker knows no distinction of castes ; he bows to God, and not to his fellow-servant. 'All men are alike by creation,' says Barclay ;² and it is slavish fear which reverences others as gods. 'I am a man,'³ says every Quaker, and refuses homage. The most favored of his race,⁴ even though endowed with the gifts and glories of an angel, he would regard but his fellow-servant and his brother. The feudal nobility still nourished its pride. 'Nothing,' says Penn,⁵ 'nothing of man's folly has less show of reason to palliate it.'—'What a pothor has this noble blood made in the world !'—'But men of blood have no marks of honor stampd upon them by nature.' The Quaker scorned to take off his hat to any of them ; he held himself the peer of the proudest peer in Christendom. With the eastern despotism of Diocletian, Europe had learned the hyperboles of eastern adulation ; but, 'My Lord Peter and My Lord Paul are not to be found in the Bible ; My Lord Solon or Lord Scipio is not to be read in Greek or Latin stories.' And the Quaker returned to the simplicity of Gracchus and Demosthenes, though 'Thee and Thou proved a sore cut to proud flesh.'⁶ This was not done for want of courtesy, which 'no religion destroys ;' but he knew that the hat was the symbol of enfranchisement, worn before the king by the peers of the realm, in token of equality ;—and the symbol, as adopted by the Quaker, was a constant proclamation that all men are equal.

"Thus the doctrine of George Fox was not only a plebeian form of philosophy, but also the prophecy of political changes. The spirit that made to him the revelation was the invisible spirit of the age, rendered wise by tradition, and excited to insurrection by the enthusiasm of liberty and religion. Everywhere in Europe, therefore, the Quakers were exposed to persecution.⁷

¹ Besse, Vol. II, p. 528.

² Barclay p. 541.

³ Ib. p. 504.

⁴ Ib. p. 505.

⁵ Vol. I. p. 480.

⁶ Fox.

⁷ "The behavior of the Quakers," says Bishop Burnet, "was very extraordinary, and had something in it that looked like the spirit of martyrdom. They met at the same place and hour as in times of liberty, and when the officers came to seize them none of them would stir. They went all together to prison. They staid there till they were dismissed ; for they would not petition to be set at liberty, nor pay the

lines set upon them, nor so much as the prison-fees. When they were discharged, they went to their meeting-house again, as before ; and when the doors were shut up by order, they assembled in great numbers in the street before the doors, saying that they would not be ashamed nor afraid to disown their meeting together in a peaceable manner to worship God ;—but, in imitation of the prophet Daniel, they would do it more publicly, because they were forbid. Some called this obstinacy, others firmness ; but by it they carried their point, the government being weary of contending against so much perverseness." It has been truly remarked that, had Bishop Burnet "con-

Their seriousness was called melancholy fanaticism ; their boldness, self-will ; their frugality, covetousness ; their freedom, infidelity ; their conscience, rebellion. In England, the general laws against dissenters, the statute against Papists, and special statutes against themselves, put them at the mercy of every malignant informer. They were hated by the church and the Presbyterians, by the peers and the king. The codes of that day describe them as ‘an abominable sect ;’—‘their principles as inconsistent with any kind of government.’ During the Long Parliament, in the time of the Protectorate, at the Restoration, in England, in New England, in the Dutch colony of New Netherlands, everywhere and for wearisome years they were exposed to perpetual dangers and griefs. They were whipped, crowded into jails among felons, kept in dungeons foul and gloomy beyond imagination, fined, exiled, sold into colonial bondage.¹ They bore the brunt of the persecution of the dissenters. Imprisoned in winter without fire, they perished from frost. Some were victims to the barbarous cruelty of the jailer. Twice George Fox narrowly escaped death. The despised people braved every danger to continue their assemblies. Haled out by violence, they returned. When their meeting-houses were torn down,² they gathered openly on the ruins. They could not be dissolved by armed men ; and, when their opposers took shovels to throw rubbish on them, they stood close together, ‘willing to have been buried alive, witnessing for the Lord.’ They were

cluded with the word *perseverance*, instead of perverseness, his description had been less objectionable, as being nearer the truth.”—*Neal's Puritans*, Vol. III, p. 170.

¹ “Let us bear in mind,” says Hon. Joel Parker, (in a recent lecture on the early legislation of Mass.) “that it was not for non-conformity that the Quakers were prosecuted. I maintain without hesitation, that so far from the Puritans persecuting the Quakers, it was the Quakers who persecuted the Puritans.”

“Upon the question whether their institutions were endangered by the Quakers, the Puritans are entitled to be heard. In a humble petition and address of the General Court, presented to the king in February, 1660, it is, among other things, said,—

“Concerning the Quakers, open, capital blasphemers, open seducers from the glorious Trinity, the Lord's Christ, our Lord Jesus Christ, &c., the blessed Gospel, and from the Holy Scriptures as the rule of life, open enemies to government itself as estab-

lished in the hands of any but men of their own principles, malignant and assiduous promoters of doctrines directly tending to subvert both our churches and state ; after all other means, for a long time used in vain, we were at last constrained, for our own safety, to pass a sentence of banishment against them, upon pain of death. Such was their dangerous, impetuous, and desperate turbulency, both to religion and to the state, civil and ecclesiastical, as that, how unwilling soever, could it have been avoided, the magistrate at last, in conscience both to God and man, judged himself called, for the defence of all, to keep the passage with the point of the sword held toward them. This could do no harm to him that would be warned thereby ; their wittingly rushing themselves thereupon was their own act, and we, with all humility, conceive a crime bringing their bloods upon their own head.”—*Mass. Records*, Vol. IV, part 1, p. 451.

² Barclay, pp. 483, 484, 356.

exceeding great sufferers for their profession, and in some cases treated worse than the worst of the race."¹

But their sufferings, though great for a season, were not without their permanent compensations. "The Quakers had," says Macaulay, "since the Restoration, in spite of much ill-usage, submitted themselves meekly to the royal authority; for they had, though reasoning on premises which the Anglican divines regarded as heterodox, arrived, like the Anglican divines, at the conclusion that no excess of tyranny on the part of the prince can justify active resistance on the part of a subject. No libel on the government had ever been traced to a Quaker. In no conspiracy against the government had a Quaker been implicated. The society had not joined in the clamor for the Exclusion Bill; and had solemnly condemned the Rye-house Plot as a hellish design, and a work of the devil. Indeed, the Friends then took very little part in civil contentions; for they were not, as now, congregated in large towns, but were generally engaged in agriculture, a pursuit from which they have been gradually driven by the vexations consequent on their strange scruple about paying tithe. They were, therefore, far removed from the scene of political strife. They also, even in domestic privacy, avoided, on principle, all political conversation; for such conversation was, in their opinion unfavorable to spirituality of mind, and tended to disturb the austere composure of their deportment." * * *

"It happened, moreover, that it was possible to grant large relief to the Roman Catholic and to the Quaker without mitigating the suffering of the Puritan sects. A law which was then in force imposed severe penalties on every person who refused to take the oath of supremacy, when required to do so. This law did not affect Presbyterians, Independents, or Baptists, for they were all ready to call God to witness that they renounced all spiritual connection with foreign prelates and potentates; but the Roman Catholic would not swear that the Pope had no jurisdiction in England, and the Quaker would not swear to anything. On the other hand, neither the Roman Catholic nor the Quaker was touched by the Five Mile Act, which, of all the laws in the statute-book, was perhaps the most annoying to the Puritan nonconformists."²

Although it may be admitted that royal favors were granted with some reference to public interests, yet it would hardly be denied that those interests were too often seen through the refracting medium of favoritism and selfishness. The fact that the king insisted upon a name that was complimentary to the father of Penn indicated a gratified mind, and that the arrangement was quite in accordance with his majesty's wishes. This supposition is more reasonable than to suppose that Penn was equally satisfied in surrendering so large a debt for a questionable property.

¹ Fox, Pref., Vol. VII, p. 10.

² Hist. of Eng., Vol. I, pp. 467-8.

He called the territory *his country*. "After many waitings, watchings, solicitings and disputes in the council," he writes, "my country was confirmed to me under the great seal of England. God will bless and make it the seed of a nation. I shall have a tender care of the government, that it will be well laid at first."

On the 8th of April, 1681, he issued the following proclamation to his vassals and subjects:¹

"My friends: I wish you all happiness here and hereafter. These are to

¹ Pennsylvania included the principal settlements of the Swedes; and patents for land had been made to Dutch and English by the Dutch West India Company, and afterwards by the Duke of York.

To perfect his territory (1682), Penn desired to possess the bay, the river, and the shore of the Delaware to the ocean. The territories, or three lower counties, now forming the State of Delaware, were in possession of the Duke of York; and, from the conquest of New Netherlands, had been esteemed an appendage to his province. His claim, arising from conquest and possession, had the informal assent of the king and the privy council, and had extended even to the upper Swedish settlements. It was not difficult to obtain from the duke a release of his claim on Pennsylvania; and, after much negotiation, the lower province was granted by two deeds of feoffment. From the forty-third degree of latitude to the Atlantic, the western and southern banks of Delaware river and bay were under the dominion of William Penn.—*Bancroft*, Vol. II, pp. 368, 367.

The territories were divided into three counties, and were called Newcastle, Kent and Sussex, and at this time were inhabited principally by Dutch and Swedes. In 1682, with the consent of the people, an act of union with the province of Pennsylvania was passed, and an act of settlement of a frame of government in a General Assembly, composed of deputies from the counties of Delaware and Pennsylvania. By this act the counties were, under the name of territories, annexed to the province, and were to be represented in the General Assembly, governed by the same laws, and

to enjoy the same privileges, as the inhabitants of Pennsylvania. Difficulties soon after arose between the deputies of the province and those of the territories; and, after various subordinate arrangements, a final separation took place between them, with the consent of the proprietary, in 1703. From that period down to the American Revolution, the territories were governed by a separate legislature of their own, pursuant to the liberty reserved to them by a clause in the original charter, or frame of government.

"The lower counties," says Bancroft, "became at once almost an independent democracy; for, as the authority of the proprietary was one of sufferance merely (1708), and was often brought into question, the executive power intrusted to the Governor of Pennsylvania was too feeble to limit the power of the people. Delaware had its own legislature, its own tribunals, its own executive offices, and virtually enjoyed an absolute self-government."—Vol. III, p. 44.

The proper boundaries between the domains of Lord Baltimore and William Penn were considered before the committee of trade, and in 1685 the present limits of Delaware were settled by compromise. This decision formed the basis of an agreement between the respective heirs of the two proprietaries in 1732. Three years afterwards, the subject became a question in chancery; in 1750 the present boundaries were decreed by Lord Hardwicke. Ten years afterwards they were, by agreement, more accurately defined; and, in 1761, the line between Maryland and Pennsylvania towards the west was run by Mason and

lett you know that it hath pleased God in his providence to cast you within my lott and care. It is a business that, though I never undertook before, yet God has given me an understanding of my duty, and an honest minde to doe it uprightly. I hope you will not be troubled at your chainge and the king's choice; for you are now fixt at the mercy of no governour that comes to make his fortune great. You shall be governed by laws of your own makeing, and live a free, and, if you will, a sober and industrious People. I shall not usurp the right of any, or oppress his person. God has furnisht me with a better resolution, and has given me his grace to keep it. In short, whatever sober and free men can reasonably desire, for the security and improvement of their own happiness, I shall heartily comply with. I beseech God to direct you in the way of righteousness, and therein prosper you and your children after you. I am your true friend."

"Such," says Bancroft, "were the pledges of the Quaker sovereign, on assuming the government. It is the duty of history to state that, during his long reign, these pledges were redeemed."

In July, 1681, the proprietor published "certain conditions, or concessions,¹ to adventurers," planned a form of government, and appointed William

Dixon. (See *Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 394.) Day says (*Hist. Coll.* p. 28), "In 1767 Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, two distinguished mathematicians and astronomers, were employed to run the line, and erect stone pillars at conspicuous points." Hence the so famous "Mason and Dixon's Line."

¹ CERTAIN CONDITIONS, OR CONCESSIONS, Agreed upon by William Penn, Proprietary and Governor of the Province of Pennsylvania, and those who are the adventurers and purchasers in the same province, the eleventh of July, one thousand six hundred and eighty-one.

First. That so soon as it pleaseth God that the above said persons arrive there, a quantity of land or Ground plat shall be laid out for a large Town or City in the most convenient place upon the River for health and navigation; and every purchaser and adventurer shall by lot have so much land therein as will answer to the proportion which he hath bought or taken up upon rent, But it is to be noted that the surveyors shall consider what Roads or Highways will be necessary to the Cities, Towns, or through the lands. Great roads from City to City not to contain less

than forty feet in breadth shall be first laid out and declared to be for highways before the Dividend of acres be laid out for the purchaser and the like observation to be had for the streets in the Towns and Cities, that there may be convenient roads and streets preserved not to be encroached upon by any planter or builder that none may build irregularly to the damage of another. In this custom governs.

Secondly. That the land in the Town be laid out together after the proportion of ten thousand acres of the whole country, that is two hundred acres, if the place will bear it: However that the proportion be by lot and entire so as those that desire to be together, especially those that are by the catalogue laid together, may be so laid together both in the Town and Country.

Thirdly. That when the country lots are laid out, every purchaser from one thousand to Ten thousand acres or more, not to have above One thousand acres together, unless in three years they plant a family upon every thousand acres; but that all such as purchase together, lie together; and if as many as comply with this Condition, that the whole be laid out together.

Markham, a relative, to take possession of the country, and prepare the way for emigrants. Three ships were freighted, and a considerable number,

Fourthly. That where any number of purchasers, more or less, whose number of acres amount to Five or ten thousand acres, desire to sit together in a lot or Township, they shall have their lot or Township cast together, in such places as have convenient Harbors or navigable rivers attending it, if such can be found, and in case any one or more Purchasers plant not according to agreement, in this concession to the prejudice of others of the same Township upon complaint thereof, made to the Governor or his deputy, with assistance they may award (if they see cause) that the complaining purchaser may, paying the survey money, and purchase money, and Interest thereof, be entitled, inrolled and lawfully invested in the lands so not seated.

Fifthly. That the proportion of lands that shall be laid out in the first great Town or City, for every purchaser, shall be, after the proportion of ten acres, for every Five hundred acres purchased, if the place will allow it.

Sixthly. That notwithstanding there be no mention made in the several Deeds made to the purchasers, yet the said William Penn does accord and declare, that all Rivers, Rivulets, Woods and Underwoods, Waters, Watercourses, Quarries, Mines and Minerals, (except mines Royal,) shall be freely and fully enjoyed and wholly by the purchasers into whose lot they fall.

Seventhly. That for every Fifty acres that shall be allotted to a servant, at the end of his service, his Quitrent shall be two shillings per annum, and the master or owner of the Servant, when he shall take up the other Fifty acres, his Quitrent shall be Four shillings by the year, or if the master of the servant, (by reason in the Indentures he is so obliged to do,) allot out to the Servant Fifty acres in his own Division, the said master shall have on demand allotted him from the Governor, the One hundred acres, at the chief rent of Six shillings per annum.

Eighthly. And for the encouragement of such as are ingenious, and willing to search out Gold and silver mines in this province, it is hereby agreed that they have liberty to bore and dig in any man's property, fully paying the damage done, and in case a Discovery should be made, that the discoverer have one Fifth, the owner of the soil (if not the Discoverer) a Tenth part, the Governor Two fifths, and the rest to the public Treasury, saving to the king the share reserved by patent.

Ninthly. In every hundred thousand acres, the Governor and Proprietary by lot reserveth Ten to himself, which shall lie but in one place.

Tenthly. That every man shall be bound to plant or man so much of his share of Land as shall be set out and surveyed within three years after it is so set out and surveyed, or else it shall be lawful for new comers to be settled thereupon, paying to them their survey money, and they go up higher for their shares.

Eleventhly. There shall be no buying and selling, be it with an Indian, or one among another of any Goods to be exported but what shall be performed in public market, when such place shall be set apart or erected, where they shall pass the public Stamp or Mark. If bad ware and prized as good, or deceitful in proportion or weight, to forfeit the value as if good, and full weight and proportion to the public Treasury of the Province, whether it be the merchandise of the Indian or that of the Planters.

Twelfthly. And forasmuch as it is usual with the planters to over-reach the poor natives of the Country in Trade, by Goods not being good of the kind, or debased with mixtures, with which they are sensibly aggrieved, it is agreed, whatever is sold to the Indians, in consideration of their furs, shall be sold in the market place, and there suffer the test, whether good or bad; if good to pass; if not good, not to be sold

mostly Quakers, accompanied Markham to America. An association,¹ was formed at London and Bristol,—the “Free Society of Traders,”—who purchased lands, with distinct views to agriculture, manufactories, and for carrying on the lumber trade and whale fisheries.

Penn himself did not leave England till August 30, 1682. He sailed in the ship *Welcome*, accompanied by near a hundred persons; and after a long and trying passage, “rendered gloomy by frequent death,” arrived at Newcastle on the 27th day of October, 1682.

for good, that the natives may not be abused nor provoked.

Thirteenthly. That no man shall by any ways or means, in word or deed, affront or wrong any Indian, but he shall incur the same penalty of the Law, as if he had committed it against his fellow-planters; and if any Indian shall abuse, in Word or Deed, any planter of this province, that he shall not be his own Judge upon the Indian, but he shall make his complaint to the Governor of the province, or his Lieutenant or Deputy, or some inferior magistrate near him, who shall, to the utmost of his power, take care with the king of the said Indian, that all reasonable Satisfaction be made to the said injured planter.

Fourteenthly. That all differences between the Planters and the natives, shall also be ended by Twelve men, that is, by Six planters and Six natives, that so we may live friendly together as much as in us lieth, preventing all occasions of Heart burnings and mischief.

Fifteenthly. That the Indians shall have liberty to do all things relating to improvement of their Ground, and providing sustenance for the families, that any of the planters shall enjoy.

Sixteenthly. That the laws as to Slanders, Drunkenness, Swearing, Cursing, Pride in apparel, Trespasses, Distresses, Replevins, Weights and measures, shall be the same as in England, till altered by law in this province.

Seventeenthly. That all shall mark their hogs, sheep and other cattle, and what are not marked within three months after it is in their possession, be it young or old, it shall be forfeited to the Governor, that so

people may be compelled to avoid the occasions of much strife between Planters.

Eighteenthly. That in clearing the ground, care be taken to leave One acre of trees for every five acres cleared, especially to preserve oak and mulberries, for silk and shipping.

Nineteenthly. That all ship masters shall give an account of their Countries, Names, Ships, Owners, Freights and Passengers, to an officer to be appointed for that purpose, which shall be registered within Two days after their arrival; and if they shall refuse so to do that then none presume to trade with them, upon forfeiture thereof; and that such masters be looked upon as having an evil intention to the province.

Twentiethly. That no person leave the Province without publication being made thereof in the market place, Three weeks before, and a certificate from some Justice of the peace, of his clearness with his neighbors and those he has dealt withal, so far as such an assurance can be attained and given: and if any master of a ship shall contrary hereunto receive, and carry away any person that hath not given that public notice, the said master shall be liable to all debts owing by the said person, so secretly transported from the province. Lastly, that these are to be added to or corrected by and with the consent of the parties herunto subscribed.

Sealed and delivered in the presence of
WILLIAM PENN, and others.

¹ Penn was opposed to monopolies. In 1681 he was offered, by a company of traders, six thousand pounds and an annual revenue for a monopoly of the Indian traffic

"The news spread rapidly," says Bancroft, "that the Quaker king was at Newcastle; and, on the day after his landing, in presence of a crowd of Swedes, and Dutch, and English, who had gathered round the court-house his deeds of feoffment were produced. The Duke of York's agent surrendered the territory by the solemn delivery of earth and water, and Penn, invested with supreme and undefined power in Delaware, addressed the assembled multitude on government, recommended sobriety and peace, and pledged himself to grant liberty of conscience and civil freedom."¹

But, as the colony increased in numbers, new principles of action were developed. "After the predominance in England of the Protestant succession, by the Revolution of 1688, the Quakers were no longer compelled to go to America to avoid persecution; while a new set of men, bent more upon making their fortunes than upon the defence or promotion of high religious principle, were induced to emigrate. These were either of the Church of England or Presbyterians from Scotland and Ireland, and were not averse to bearing arms. The adventurous traders of New England, too, trained in the school of Puritan republicanism, were also coming to seek their gains in the genial climate of the south. Among these was the boy Benjamin Franklin, the new master-spirit of Pennsylvania, who arrived in October, 1723. The Mennonists, or German Baptists,—a sect which adhered to the principle of non-resistance,—persecuted in Europe, and driven from one country to another, sought the toleration of Penn's colony, and emigrated between the years 1698 and 1717,—many, in the latter year, settling in Lancaster, Berks, and the upper part of Chester county. The Dunkards, also a non-resistant sect, began to emigrate about the year 1718, and subsequently established a sort of monastery and convent at Ephrata, in Lancaster county. The Lutheran Germans, who, on the other hand, were not averse to fighting when occasion required it, began now to emigrate in great numbers, settling principally in Berks and Lancaster counties. Amid this great diversity of races, languages, sectarian and political prejudices, were early planted the seeds of strife that agitated the province for more than fifty years, and terminated only in the American Revolution."²

In respect to the subject of government, Penn considered man as the deputy of his Maker, not only qualified by skill and capacity for so great a charge and trust, but religiously bound to be honest, and to do justice. With him, government was made a part of his religion, and he recognized

between the Delaware and the Susquehanna. His answer was prompt and noble. "I will not abuse the love of God," said he, "nor act unworthy of his providence, by defiling what came to me clean. No! let the Lord guide me by his wisdom, to honor his name and serve his truth and

people, that an example and a standard may be set up to the nations;" and he adds to a friend, "There may be room there, though not here, for the Holy Experiment."—*Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 865.

¹ Vol. II, p. 880.

² Day's Hist. Coll., p. 880.

in its institution and end divine control. He studied the subject with an evident desire to frame a system that should meet the numerous contingencies incident to the nature of man. Goodness was pronounced the safest basis, and the practice of virtue the safest policy. He attempted to solve the great problem as to the best form of government, by admitting the most important element which is peculiar to one and common to all, and stated a condition which was self-evident, but which failed to explain itself in its forced connection.¹ He clearly saw in Democracy the true principles of government, but he sought to reduce those principles to practice by monarchical means.² Instead of viewing the form of government as a result of the condition of the people, he preferred to show that the success of government depended upon the goodness of man, without reference to form. In some degree this was true. But, in premising that it was necessary that the people should be a party to the laws, he omitted to estimate their necessary share of power in such a position. People are not to be satisfied with a nominal position, which admits of their agency in the theory, but denies it in practice. In adopting the property power of control, he decided merely a question of interest, but not of principle, in relation to rights. He doubtless was governed by liberal, and it may have been by magnanimous motives; but such motives require to be limited by considerations of a prudential nature, to say nothing of their inapplicability to questions of a public policy.³ Individual interest may sometimes run parallel to public interest; but to rely upon a permanent parallelism between two interests so dissimilar in their nature, would seem to imply either a want of judgment or the want

¹ See 8d division of his Preface, p. 224, quoted in this chapter.

² The Quaker proprietaries in England declared for Democracy, but not with revolutionary motives against monarchy. Their language to the few who had emigrated (in 1676) is thus quoted by Bancroft: "The CONCESSIONS are such as Friends approve of. We lay a foundation for after ages to understand their liberties as Christians and as men, that they may not be brought into bondage, but by their own consent; for we put THE POWER IN THE PEOPLE." The charter and fundamental laws of West New Jersey were perfected and published March 3, 1677. "They are written with almost as much method as our present constitutions, and recognize the principle of democratic equality as unconditionally and universally as the Quaker society itself.—VOL. II, p. 857.

Pennsylvania and Delaware, and West New Jersey, and Rhode Island, and in some measure North Carolina, were Quaker states.—Ib. VOL. II, p. 402. "But for the hereditary office of proprietary, Pennsylvania had been a representative democracy."—VOL. II, p. 889. It might be added, perhaps with equal truth, that *with* a hereditary proprietary a representative democracy would be impossible.

³ "That Penn was superior to avarice, was clear from his lavish expenditures to relieve the imprisoned; that he had risen above ambition, appeared from his preference of the despised Quakers to the career of high advancement in the court of Charles II. But he loved to do good; and could passionate philanthropy resign absolute power, apparently so favorable to the exercise of vast benevolence? 'I purpose,' said he,

of knowledge. To say that Penn was either ignorant, or deficient in powers of discernment, viewed in relation to the age in which he lived, would be an act of great injustice to his memory.¹ He was a close student of history, and a skilful logician. He manifested even a solicitude to avail himself of all the aids which God had given him, in his own powers and consciousness, and to learn from the experiments of men and nations the conditions of successful endeavor. But he started with an error, and this error produced its natural fruit. Tares had been sown with the wheat, and why should the reaper look forward to an unmixed crop? The liberality of his administration could not alter the nature of the principles of his frame of government, as to property; his concessions to freedom could not change the source of power as to sovereignty; and he lived to realize the difference always to be found existing between resolution and practice in the individual, and between democracy and feudalism in society.² He had failed to understand the mission of feudalism, and to discover that society was in advance of those necessities which gave it birth. Sovereignty was claimed by the people; and, so far from gaining their consent to have it otherwise lodged by liberal measures, it will appear obvious, in the very nature of things, that liberal measures which concede equal rights, and provide for the impartial execution of justice, prepare the public mind more and more for the realization of those blessings which can spring only from democratic institutions. It is not enough for man, however good, to make promises to the people; for, if the people have been led to believe that they are to be trusted, they are not likely to be ignorant of the fact that even the right of making promises alone belongs to them, and not to him.

But, when Penn has explained his own views on government, it may seem like presumption not to introduce them without preliminary remarks. The

‘for the matters of liberty, I purpose that which is extraordinary, to leave myself and successors no power of doing mischief,—that the will of one man may not hinder the good of a whole country.’—*Ib.*, VOL. II, p. 366.

In his great devotion to the *inner light*, he expressed more confidence in principles than fears of failure in practice. His spiritual freedom was endangered by his proprietary interests. The greater good was left subordinate to the inferior agent.

¹ When Penn published his book, entitled *“Some Fruits of Solitude, in Reflections and Maxims relating to the Conduct of Human Life,”* he had seen much of the world. He had travelled in his own

country and in Ireland. He had visited France, Holland, and Germany. He had lived in America, then reputed a new quarter of the globe. He had surveyed, therefore, men under different tongues, colors, climates, manners, religions, and governments. He had tasted both the sweet and bitter fruits of prosperity and adversity.—See *Clarkson*, VOL. II, p. 38.

² “The relations of Penn to his colony,” says Bancroft, “were two-fold; he was their sovereign, and he was the owner of the unappropriated domain.”—VOL. III, p. 42. And further, “Divesting himself and his successors of all power to injure, he had founded a Democracy. By the necessity of the case he remained its feudal sover-

following is the language of the "Preface to the Frame of Government" which he prepared for the "Province of Pennsylvania:"

"When the great and wise God had made the world, of all his creatures it pleased him to choose man his deputy to rule it; and, to fit him for so great a charge and trust, he did not only qualify him with skill and power, but with integrity to use them justly. This native goodness was equally his honor and his happiness; and, whilst he stood here, all went well. There was no need of coercive or compulsive means. The precept of divine love and truth in his bosom was the guide and keeper of his innocency. But lust prevailing against duty, made a lamentable breach upon it; and the law that before had no power over him, took place upon him and his disobedient posterity, that such as would not live conformable to the holy law within should fall under the reproof and correction of the just law without, in a judicial administration.

"This the apostle teaches in divers of his epistles. The law (says he) was added because of transgression. In another place, knowing that the law was not made for the righteous man, but for the disobedient and ungodly, for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, and for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, &c. But this is not all; he opens and carries the matter of government a little further: Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. He is the minister of God to thee for good. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscience' sake.

"This settles the divine right of government beyond exception, and that for two ends. First, to terrify evil doers; secondly, to cherish those that do well,—which gives government a life beyond corruption, and makes it as durable in the world as good men shall be. So that government seems to me a part of religion itself,—a thing sacred in its institution and end. For, if it does not directly remove the cause, it crushes the effects of evil, and is as such (though a lower yet) an emanation of the same divine power that is both author and object of pure religion,—the difference lying here, that the one is more free and mental, the other more corporal and compulsive, in

eign; for it was only as such that he could remove the inconsistency."—VOL. III, pp. 43, 44. But "the necessity of the case" have granted or could maintain the charter does not alter the principle, and to speak of of colonial liberties. His resignation would "inconsistency" is to admit the discovery have been a surrender of the colony to the crown. But time and the people would of error.

its operations. But that is only to evil-doers ; government itself being otherwise as capable of kindness, goodness, and charity, as a more private society. They weakly err that think there is no other use of government than correction, which is the coarsest part of it. Daily experience tells us that the care and regulation of many other affairs more soft and daily necessary make up much the greatest part of government ; and which must have followed the peopling of the world, had Adam never fell, and will continue among men on earth under the highest attainments they may arrive at, by the coming of the blessed second Adam, the Lord from heaven. Thus much of government in general, as to its rise and end.

“ For particular frames and models, it will become me to say little ; and, comparatively, I will say nothing. My reasons are : first, that the age is too nice and difficult for it, there being nothing the wits of men are more busy and divided upon. 'Tis true, they seem to agree in the end, to wit, happiness ; but in the means they differ, as to divine, so to this human felicity. And the cause is much the same ; not always want of light and knowledge, but want of using them rightly. Men side with their passions against their reason, and their sinister interests have so strong a bias upon their minds, that they lean to them against the good of the things they know.

“ Secondly, I do not find a model in the world that time, place and some singular emergencies, have not necessarily altered ; nor is it easy to frame a civil government that shall serve all places alike.

“ Thirdly, I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, which are the rule of one, a few, and many, and are the three common ideas of government, when men discourse on that subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three. Any government is free to the people under it (whatever be the frame) where the laws rule, and the people are a party to those laws ; and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, and confusion.

“ But, lastly, when all is said, there is hardly one frame of government in the world so ill-designed by its founders, that, in good hands, would not do well enough ; and story tells us, the best in ill ones can do nothing that is great or good. Witness the Jewish and Roman states. Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them ; and, as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too. Wherefore governments rather depend upon men, than men upon governments. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad ; if it be ill, they will cure it. But if men be bad, let the government be never so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it to their turn.

“ I know some say, let us have good laws, and no matter for the men that execute them. But, let them consider that, though good laws do well, good men do better ; for good laws may want good men, and be abolished or invaded by ill men ;—but good men will never want good laws, nor suffer

ill ones. 'Tis true, good laws have some awe upon ill ministers; but that is where they have not power to escape or abolish them, and the people are generally wise and good. But a loose and depraved people (which is to the question) love laws and an administration like themselves. That, therefore, which makes a good constitution must keep it, namely, men of wisdom and virtue,—qualities that, because they descend not with worldly inheritances, must be carefully propagated by a virtuous education of youth, for which after ages will owe more to the care and prudence of founders and the successive magistracy, than to their parents, for their private patrimonies.

“These considerations of the weight of government, and the nice and various opinions about it, made it uneasy to me to think of publishing the ensuing frame and conditional laws,¹ foreseeing both the censures they will meet with from men of differing humors and engagements, and the occasion they may give of discourse beyond my design.

¹ THE FRAME.

TO ALL PEOPLE to whom these presents shall come. WHEREAS King Charles the Second, by his letters patents, under the great seal of England, for the consideration therein mentioned, hath been graciously pleased to give and grant unto me, William Penn (by the name of William Penn, Esq., son and heir of Sir William Penn, deceased), and to my heirs and assigns forever, all that tract of land or province, called Pennsylvania, in America, with divers great powers, preeminences, royalties, jurisdictions, and authorities, necessary for the well-being and government thereof: NOW KNOW YE that for the well-being and government of the said province, and for the encouragement of all the freemen and planters that may be therein concerned, in pursuance of the powers aforementioned, I the said William Penn have declared, granted, and confirmed, and by these presents, for me, my heirs and assigns, do declare, grant and confirm unto all the freemen, planters and adventurers, of, in and to the said province, these liberties, franchises, and properties, to be held, enjoyed and kept by the freemen, planters and inhabitants of the said province of Pennsylvania, forever.

Imprimis. That the government of this province shall, according to the powers of

the patent, consist of the Governor and freemen of the said province, in form of a Provincial Council and General Assembly, by whom all laws shall be made, officers chosen, and public affairs transacted, as is hereafter respectively declared. That is to say,

Second. That the freemen of the said province shall, on the twentieth day of the twelfth month which shall be in this present year, one thousand six hundred eighty and two, meet and assemble in some fit place, of which timely notice shall be beforehand given, by the governor or his deputy, and then and there shall choose out of themselves seventy-two persons of most note for their wisdom, virtue and ability, who shall meet on the tenth of the first month next ensuing, and always be called an act as the Provincial Council of the said province.

Third. That at the first choice of such Provincial Council, one-third part of the said Provincial Council shall be chosen to serve for three years next ensuing; one-third part for two years then next ensuing, and one third part for one year then next following such election, and no longer; and that the said third part shall go out accordingly. And on the twentieth day of the twelfth month as aforesaid, yearly forever afterward, the freemen of the said province shall in like manner meet and assemble

"But next to the power of necessity (which is a solicitor that will take no denial) this induced me to a compliance, that we have (with reverence to God, and good conscience to men) to the best of our skill contrived and

together, and then choose twenty-four persons, being one-third of the said number, to serve in Provincial Council for three years. It being intended, that one-third part of the whole Provincial Council (always consisting and to consist of seventy-two persons, as aforesaid) falling off yearly, it shall be yearly supplied by such new yearly elections, as aforesaid; and that no one person shall continue therein longer than three years: and in case any member shall decease before the last election during his time, that then, at the next election ensuing his decease, another shall be chosen to supply his place for the remaining time he was to have served, and no longer.

Fourth. That after the first seven years, every one of the said third parts that goeth yearly off shall be incapable of being chosen again for one whole year following; that so all may be fitted for government, and have experience and care and burden of it.

Fifth. That the Provincial Council, in all cases of matters of moment, as their arguing upon bills to be passed into laws, erecting courts of justice, giving judgment upon criminals impeached, and choice of officers, in such manner as is herein after mentioned, not less than two-thirds of the whole Provincial Council shall make a quorum; and that the consent and approbation of two-thirds of such quorum shall be had in all such cases and matters of moment. And, moreover, that in all cases and matters of lesser moment twenty-four members of the said Provincial Council shall make a quorum, the majority of which twenty-four shall and may always determine in such cases and causes of lesser moment.

Sixth. That in this Provincial Council the governor or his deputy shall or may always preside, and have a treble voice; and the said Provincial Council shall always continue, and sit upon its own adjournments and committees.

Seventh. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall prepare and propose to the General Assembly hereafter mentioned all bills which they shall at any time think fit to be passed into laws within the said province; which bills shall be published and affixed to the most noted places in the inhabited parts thereof thirty days before the meeting of the General Assembly, in order to the passing them into laws, or rejecting of them, as the General Assembly shall see meet.

Eighth. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall take care that all laws, statutes and ordinances, which shall at any time be made within the said province, be duly and dilligently executed.

Ninth. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall at all times have the care of the peace and safety of the province, and that nothing be by any person attempted to the subversion of this frame of government.

Tenth. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall at all times settle and order the situation of all cities, ports and market towns, in every county, modelling therein all public buildings, streets and market-places, and shall appoint all necessary roads and highways in the province.

Eleventh. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall at all times have power to inspect the management of the public treasury, and punish those who shall convert any part thereof to any other use than what hath been agreed upon by the Governor, Provincial Council and General Assembly.

Twelfth. That the Governor and Provincial Council shall erect and order all public schools, and encourage and reward the authors of useful sciences and laudable inventions, in the said province.

Thirteenth. That, for the better management of the powers and trust aforesaid, the Provincial Council shall from time to time divide itself into four distinct and

composed the FRAME and LAWS of this government, to the great end of all government, namely, to support power in reverence with the people, and to secure the people from the abuse of power, that they may be free by

proper committees, for the more easy administration of the affairs of the province, which divides the seventy-two into four eighteens, every one of which eighteens shall consist of six out of each of the three orders or yearly elections, each of which shall have a distinct portion of business, as followeth: first, a committee of plantations, to situate and settle cities, ports, market-towns and highways, and to hear and decide all suits and controversies relating to plantations. Secondly, a committee of justice and safety, to secure the peace of the province, and punish the maladministration of those who subvert justice to the prejudice of the public or private interest. Thirdly, a committee of trade and treasury, who shall regulate all trade and commerce according to law, encourage manufacture and country growth, and defray the public charge of the province. And fourthly, a committee of manners, education, and arts, that all wicked and scandalous living may be prevented, and that youth may be successively trained up in virtue and useful knowledge and arts: the quorum of each of which committees being six, that is, two out of each of the three orders or yearly elections as aforesaid, making a constant and standing council of twenty-four, which will have the power of the Provincial Council, being the quorum of it, in all cases not excepted in the fifth article; and in the said committees and standing Council of the province, the governor or his deputy shall or may preside as aforesaid; and in the absence of the governor or his deputy, if no one is by either of them appointed, the said committees or Council shall appoint a president for that time, and not otherwise; and what shall be resolved at such committees shall be reported to the said Council of the province, and shall be by them resolved and confirmed before the same shall be put in execution; and that these respective committees shall not sit at one and the same time, except in cases of necessity.

Fourteenth. And to the end that all laws prepared by the Governor and Provincial Council aforesaid may yet have the more full concurrence of the freemen of the province, it is declared, granted, and confirmed, that at the time and place or places for the choice of a Provincial Council as aforesaid, the said freemen shall yearly choose members to serve in General Assembly as their representatives, not exceeding two hundred persons, who shall yearly meet on the twentieth day of the second month, which shall be in the year one thousand six hundred eighty and three following, in the capital, town, or city of the said province, where during eight days the several members may freely confer with one another; and if any of them see meet, with a committee of the Provincial Council (consisting of three out of each of the four committees aforesaid, being twelve in all) which shall be at that time purposely appointed to receive from any of them proposals for the alteration or amendment of any of the said proposed and promulgated bills: and on the ninth day from their so meeting, the said General Assembly, after reading over the proposed bills by the clerk of the Provincial Council, and the occasion and motives for them being opened by the governor or his deputy, shall give their affirmative or negative, which to them seemeth best, in such manner as hereinafter is expressed. But not less than two-thirds shall make a quorum in the passing of laws and choice of such officers as are by them to be chosen.

Fifteenth. That the laws so prepared and proposed as aforesaid, that are assented to by the General Assembly, shall be enrolled as laws of the province, with this style: *By the Governor, with the assent and approbation of the freemen in Provincial Council and General Assembly.*

Sixteenth. That for the better establishment of the government and laws of this province, and to the end there may be an

their just obedience, and the magistrates honorable for their just administration: for liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery. To carry this evenness is partly owing to the constitution,

universal satisfaction in the laying of the fundamentals thereof, the General Assembly shall or may for the first year consist of all the freemen of and in the said province, and ever after it shall be yearly chosen, as aforesaid; which number of two hundred shall be enlarged as the country shall increase in people, so as it do not exceed five hundred at any time: the appointment and proportioning of which, as also, the laying and methodizing of the choice of the Provincial Council and General Assembly in future times, most equally to the divisions of the hundreds and counties, which the country shall hereafter be divided into, shall be in the power of the Provincial Council to propose, and the General Assembly to resolve.

Seventeenth. That the Governor and the Provincial Council shall erect, from time to time, standing courts of justice in such places and number as they shall judge convenient for the good government of the said province. And that the Provincial Council shall, on the thirteenth day of the first month yearly, elect and present to the governor or his deputy a double number of persons to serve for judges, treasurers, masters of rolls, within the said province for the year next ensuing; and the freeman of the said province in the county courts, when they shall be erected, and till then in the General Assembly, shall, on the three and twentieth day of the second month, yearly, elect and present to the governor or his deputy a double number of persons to serve for sheriffs, justices of the peace, and coroners, for the year next ensuing; out of which respective elections and presentments the governor or his deputy shall nominate and commissionate the proper number for each office the third day after the said presentments; or else the first named in such presentment for each office shall stand and serve for that office the year ensuing.

Eighteenth. But forasmuch as the pres-

ent condition of the province requires some immediate settlement, and admits not of so quick a revolution of officers; and to the end the said province may with all convenient speed be well ordered and settled, I William Penn do therefore think fit to nominate and appoint such persons for judges, treasurers, masters of the rolls, sheriffs, justices of the peace, and coroners, as are most fitly qualified for those employments; to whom I shall make and grant commissions for the said offices respectively, to hold to them to whom the same shall be granted for so long a time as every such person shall behave himself in the office or place to him respectively granted, and no longer. And upon the decease or displacing of any of the said officers, the succeeding officer or officers shall be chosen as aforesaid.

Nineteenth. That the General Assembly shall continue so long as may be needful to impeach criminals fit to be there impeached; to pass bills into laws, that they shall think fit to pass into laws, and till such time as the Governor and Provincial Council shall declare that they have nothing further to propose unto them for their assent and approbation; and that declaration shall be a dismissal to the General Assembly for that time, which General Assembly shall be notwithstanding capable of assembling together, upon the summons of the Provincial Council, at any time during that year, if the said Provincial Council see occasion for their so assembling.

Twentieth. That all the elections of members or representatives of the people, to serve in Provincial Council and General Assembly, and all questions to be determined by both or either of them, that relate to passing of bills into laws, to the choice of officers, to impeachments made by the General Assembly, and judgment of criminals upon such impeachments by the

and partly to the magistracy: where either of these fail, government will be subject to convulsions; but where both are wanting, it must be totally

Provincial Council, and to all other cases by them respectively judged of importance, shall be resolved and determined by the ballot; and, unless on sudden and indispensable occasions, no business in Provincial Council, or its respective committees, shall be finally determined the same day that it is moved.

Twenty-first. That at all times, when and so often as it shall happen, that the Governor shall or may be an infant, under the age of one and twenty years, and no guardians or commissioners are appointed in writing by the father of the said infant, or that such guardians or commissioners shall be deceased; that during such minority, the Provincial Council shall, from time to time, as they shall see meet, constitute and appoint guardians or commissioners, not exceeding three; one of which three shall preside as deputy and chief guardian, during such minority, and shall have and execute, with the consent of the other two, all the power of a governor, in all the public affairs and concerns of the said province.

Twenty-second. That as often as any day of the month, mentioned in any article of this charter, shall fall upon the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, the business appointed for that day shall be deferred till next day, unless in case of emergency.

Twenty-third. That no act, law, or ordinance whatsoever, shall at any time hereafter be made or done, by the governor of this province, his heirs or assigns, or by the freemen in the Provincial Council or the General Assembly, to alter, change, or diminish the form or effect of this charter, or any part or clause thereof, without the consent of the governor, his heirs or assigns, and six parts of seven of the said freemen in Provincial Council and General Assembly.

And Lastly. That I the said William Penn, for myself, my heirs and assigns, have solemnly declared, granted and con-

firmed, and do hereby solemnly declare, grant and confirm, that neither I, my heirs nor assigns, shall procure or do any thing or things whereby the liberties in this charter contained and expressed shall be infringed or broken; and if anything be procured by any person or persons contrary to these premises, it shall be held of no force or effect. In witness whereof, I the said William Penn have unto this present charter of liberties set my hand and broad seal, this five and twentieth day of the second month, vulgarly called April, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and eighty-two.

WILLIAM PENN.

LAWS AGREED UPON IN ENGLAND.

First. That the charter of liberties, declared, granted and confirmed, the five and twentieth day of the second month, called April, 1682, before divers witnesses, by William Penn, Governor and Chief Proprietary of Pennsylvania, to all the freemen and planters of the said province, is hereby declared and approved, and shall be forever held for fundamental, in the government thereof, according to the limitations mentioned in the said charter.

Second. That every inhabitant in the said province, that is or shall be a purchaser of one hundred acres of land and upwards, his heirs and assigns, and every person who shall have paid his passage, and taken up one hundred acres of land, at one penny an acre, and have cultivated ten acres thereof, and every person that hath been a servant or bondsman, and is free by his service, that shall have taken up his fifty acres of land, and cultivated twenty thereof, and every inhabitant, artificer, or other resident in the said province, that pays scot and lot to the government, shall be deemed and accounted a freeman of the said province; and every such person shall and may be capable of electing or being elected representatives of the people in Provincial

subverted : then where both meet, the government is like to endure. Which I humbly pray and hope God will please to make the lot of this of Pennsylvania. Amen."

Council or General Assembly in the said province.

Third. That all elections of members or representatives of the people and free-men of the province of Pennsylvania, to serve in Provincial Council or General Assembly, to be held within the said province, shall be free and voluntary : and that the elector that shall receive any reward or gift, in meat, drink, moneys or otherwise, shall forfeit his right to elect ; and such person as shall, directly or indirectly, give, promise, or bestow any such reward as aforesaid, to be elected, shall forfeit his election, and be thereby incapable to serve as aforesaid. And the Provincial Council and General Assembly shall be the sole judges of the regularity or irregularity of the elections of their own respective members.

Fourth. That no money or goods shall be raised upon or paid by any of the people of this province, by way of a public tax, custom or contribution, but by a law for that purpose made ; and whosoever shall levy, collect or pay any money or goods contrary thereunto, shall be held a public enemy to the province, and a betrayer of the liberties of the people thereof.

Fifth. That all courts shall be open, and justice shall neither be sold, denied or delayed.

Sixth. That in all courts all persons of all persuasions may freely appear in their own way, and according to their own manner, and there personally plead their own cause themselves, or, if unable, by their friends. And the first process shall be the exhibition of the complaint in court, fourteen days before the trial ; and, that the party complained against may be fitted for the same, he or she shall be summoned no less than ten days before, and a copy of the complaint delivered him or her, at his or her dwelling-house. But before the complaint of any person be received, he shall

solemnly declare in court that he believes in his conscience his cause is just.

Seventh. That all pleadings, processes and records in courts, shall be short, and in English, and in an ordinary and plain character, that they may be understood, and justice speedily administered.

Eighth. That all trials shall be by twelve men, and as near as may be, peers or equals, and of the neighborhood, and men without just exception. In cases of life, there shall be first twenty-four returned by the sheriff for a grand inquest, of whom twelve at least shall find the complaint to be true ; and then the twelve men, or peers, to be likewise returned by the sheriff, shall have the final judgment. But reasonable challenges shall be always admitted against the said twelve men, or any of them.

Ninth. That all fees in all cases shall be moderate, and settled by the Provincial Council and General Assembly, and be hung up in a table in every respective court ; and whosoever shall be convicted of taking more shall pay two-fold, and be dismissed his employment, one moiety of which shall go to the party wronged.

Tenth. That all prisons shall be work-houses for felons, vagrants, and loose and idle persons ; whereof, one shall be in every county.

Eleventh. That all prisoners shall be bailable by sufficient sureties, unless for capital offences, where the proof is evident, or the presumption great.

Twelfth. That all persons wrongfully imprisoned or prosecuted at law shall have double damages against the informer or prosecutor.

Thirteenth. That all prisons shall be free, as to fees, food, and lodging.

Fourteenth. That all hands and goods shall be liable to pay debts, except where there is legal issue, and then all the goods and one-third of the land only.

Fifteenth. That all wills and writing,

To understand clearly the opinions of Penn in regard to government, it is requisite that we should have distinct views of his character. What were

attested by two witnesses, shall be of the same force as to lands as other conveyances, being legally proved within forty days, either within or without the said province.

Sixteenth. That seven years' quiet possession shall give an unquestionable right, except in cases of infants, lunatics, married women, or persons beyond the seas.

Seventeenth. That all briberies and extortions whatsoever shall be severely punished.

Eighteenth. That all fines shall be moderate, and saving men's contentments, merchandise or wainage.

Nineteenth. That all marriages (not forbidden by the law of God, as to nearness of blood and affinity by marriage) shall be encouraged; but the parents or guardians shall be first consulted, and the marriage shall be published before it be solemnized; and it shall be solemnized by taking one another as husband and wife, before credible witnesses, and a certificate of the whole, under the hands of parties and witnesses, shall be brought to the proper register of that county, and shall be registered in his office.

Twentieth. And, to prevent frauds and vexatious suits within the said province, that all charters, gifts, grants, and conveyances of land (except leases for a year or under), and all bills, bonds and specialties, have five pounds, and not under three months, made in the said province, shall be enrolled or registered in the public enrolment office of the said province within the space of two months next after the making thereof, else to be void in law. And all deeds, grants, and conveyances of land (except as aforesaid), within the said province, and made out of the said province, shall be enrolled or registered as aforesaid, within six months next after the making thereof, and settling and constituting an enrolment office or registry within the said province, else to be void in law against all persons whatsoever.

Twenty-first. That all defacers or corruptors of charters, gifts, grants, bonds, bills, wills, contracts and conveyances, or that shall deface or falsify any enrolment, registry or record, within this province, shall make double satisfaction for the same; half whereof shall go to the party wronged, and they shall be dismissed of all places of trust, and be publicly disgraced as false men.

Twenty-second. That there shall be a register for births, marriages, burials, wills, and letters of administration, distinct from the other registry.

Twenty-third. That there shall be a register for all servants, where their names, time, wages, and days of payment, shall be registered.

Twenty-fourth. That all lands and goods of felons shall be liable to make satisfaction to the party wronged twice the value: and, for want of lands or goods, the felons shall be bondmen to work in the common prison or work-house, or otherwise, till the party injured be satisfied.

Twenty-fifth. That the estates of capital offenders, as traitors and murderers, shall go one-third to the next kin to the sufferer, and the remainder to the next of kin to the criminal.

Twenty-sixth. That all witnesses, coming or called to testify their knowledge in or to any matter or thing in any court, or before any lawful authority within the said province, shall there give or deliver in their evidence or testimony, by solemnly promising to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to the matter or thing in question. And in case any person so called to evidence shall be convicted of wilful falsehood, such person shall suffer and undergo such damage or penalty as the person or persons against whom he or she bore false witness did or should undergo; and shall also make satisfaction to the party wronged, and be publicly exposed as a false witness, never to be credited in any court, or

his motives, and in what way did he endeavor to accomplish his ends? The opinions of an individual are usually self-explanatory, and their meaning is generally to be found in the terms employed by their author to express them. They may have been uttered with holy or ignoble motives, with benevolent or evil purposes, with a lofty or a grovelling spirit, and yet be read and understood alike by all. A good man may commit errors,—a bad man may speak the truth. A wise man may have his follies,—a foolish one his wit. In these cases opinion is either at war with character, or character,

before any magistrate, in the said province.

Twenty-seventh. And to the end that all officers chosen to serve within this province may with more care and diligence answer the trust reposed in them, it is agreed that no such person shall enjoy more than one public office at one time.

Twenty-eighth. That all children within this province, of the age of twelve years, shall be taught some useful trade or skill, to the end none may be idle, but the poor may work to live, and the rich, if they become poor, may not want.

Twenty-ninth. That servants be not kept longer than their time, and such as are careful be both justly and kindly used in their service, and put in fitting equipage at the expiration thereof, according to custom.

Thirtieth. That all scandalous and malicious reporters, backbiters, defamers and spreaders of false news, whether against magistrates or private persons, shall be accordingly severely punished, as enemies to the peace and concord of this province.

Thirty-first. That, for the encouragement of the planters and traders in this province, who are incorporated into a society, the patent granted to them by William Penn, governor of the said province, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Thirty-second. * * *

Thirty-third. That all factors or correspondents in the said province wronging their employers shall make satisfaction, and one-third over, to their said employers: and

in case of death of any such factor or correspondent, the committee of trade shall take care to secure so much of the deceased party's estate as belongs to his said respective employers.

Thirty-fourth. That all treasurers, judges, masters of the rolls, sheriffs, justices of the peace, and other officers and persons whatsoever, relating to courts or trials of causes, or any other service in the government; and all members elected to serve in Provincial Council and General Assembly, and all that have right to elect such members, shall be such as profess faith in Jesus Christ, and that are not convicted of ill fame, or unsober and dishonest conversation, and that are of one and twenty years of age at least; and that all such, so qualified, shall be capable of the said several employments and privileges as aforesaid.

Thirty-fifth. That all persons living in this province, who confess and acknowledge the one almighty and eternal God, to be the creator, upholder and ruler of the world, and that hold themselves obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly in civil society, shall in no ways be molested or prejudiced for their religious persuasion or practice in matters of faith and worship, nor shall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place or ministry, whatever.

Thirty-sixth. That according to the good example of the primitive Christians, and for the ease of the creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord's day, people shall abstain from their common daily labor, that they may the better dispose themselves to worship God according to their understandings.

as a subject, has no connection with the matter upon which an opinion has been expressed. Truth is independent of intentions. Character is independent of science. Science is independent of opinions. These general propositions, like all others, have their exceptions. An exception is to be found in Penn. His theories of government, his system of conduct, and his views of public policy, were all characterized by his individual peculiarities. These peculiarities were innate. In order to understand his plans, these must be studied; in order to do justice to his character, his motives should be understood and appreciated.¹

The complexity of his public position rendered him alike the subject of

Thirty-seventh. That as careless and corrupt administration of justice draws the wrath of God upon magistrates, so the wildness and looseness of the people provoke the indignation of God against a country: therefore, that all such offences against God as swearing, cursing, lying, profane talking, drunkenness, drinking of healths, obscene words, incest, sodomy, rapes, whoredom, fornication, and other uncleanness (not to be repeated); all treasons, misprisions, murders, duels, felonies, seditions, maims, forcible entries, and other violences, to the persons and estates of the inhabitants within this province: all prizes, stage plays, cards, dice, May-games, masques, revels, bull-baitings, cock-fightings, bear-baitings and the like, which excite the people to rudeness, cruelty, looseness and irreligion, shall be respectively discouraged, and severely punished, according to the appointment of the governor and freemen in Provincial Council and General Assembly, as also all proceedings contrary to these laws, and are not here made expressly penal.

Thirty-eighth. That a copy of these laws shall be hung up in Provincial Council, and in public courts of justice; and that they shall be read yearly, at the opening of every Provincial Council and General Assembly, and courts of justice, and their assent shall be testified by their standing up, after the reading thereof.

Thirty-ninth. That there shall be at no time any alteration of any of these laws, without the consent of the governor, his heirs or

assigns, and six parts of seven of the freemen, met in Provincial Council and General Assembly.

Fortieth. That all other matters and things not herein provided for, which shall and may concern the public justice, peace or safety of the said province; and the raising and imposing taxes, customs, duties, or other charges whatsoever, shall be and are hereby referred to the order, prudence and determination of the governor and freemen in Provincial Council and General Assembly, to be held from time to time in the said province.

Signed and sealed by the governor and freeman aforesaid, the fifth day of the third month, called May, one thousand six hundred and eighty-two.

¹ Penn had no occasion to follow the custom of the Oriental monarchs, who, for a long time, were in the habit of hiding themselves in gardens and palaces, to avoid the conversation of mankind, that they might be known to their subjects only by their edicts. The reality of a beautiful character commends an opinion, if it does not sustain it. This was doubtless the view of Sir Matthew Hale, who, for a long time, it is recorded, concealed the consecration of himself to the stricter duties of religion, lest, by some flagitious and shameful actions, he should bring piety into disgrace. His confidence in example seems to have been mastered by his doubts of his moral strength. Milton, in a letter to a learned stanger, by whom he had been visited, with great reason congratulates himself upon the

suspicion, complaint, and jealousy. He was a Quaker; but, as a Christian, he placed himself in friendly relations to all¹ who opposed his sect, or viewed his brethren with compassion or contempt. He had the confidence of Royalty,² Papacy, and Protestantism. At peace with all from principle, he endeavored to serve all alike, who were governed by considerations of policy. He wished to be loyal to the king, without doing injustice to the subject. He desired to serve the humblest, without opposing the highest. He looked on every form of government as entitled to respect for what it professed to be; and, while he was ever ready to advise with all who approached him, he neither claimed the right to denounce what he could not approve, nor the privilege to participate in measures which met with his approbation. He was neutral in all things, except in his relations to Deity.³ In respect to these he compromised with none.

That one who should attempt to do so much, and assume so little, should be misapprehended and misrepresented, is in accordance with all human experience. A "charity that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things,"⁴ is not of frequent occurrence, nor is it readily understood. To be at the same time a companion to the king, an instrument of power at court, a friend to the people, an adviser to opponents,

consciousness of being found equal to his own character, and having preserved, in a private and familiar interview, that reputation which his works had procured for him.—See *Dr. Johnson's Essay's*, VOL. I, p. 133.

¹ "Possessing an extraordinary greatness of mind," says Bancroft, "vast conceptions, remarkable for their universality and precision, and 'surpassing in speculative endowments,'—conversant with men, and books, and governments, with various languages, and the forms of political combinations, as they existed in England and France, in Holland and the principalities and free cities of Germany,—he yet sought the source of wisdom in his own soul. Humane by nature and by suffering, familiar with the royal family, intimate with Sunderland and Sidney, acquainted with Russell, Halifax, Shaftesbury and Buckingham, as a member of the Royal Society, the peer of Newton, and the great scholars of his age, he valued the promptings of a free mind more than the awards of the learned, and revered the single-minded sincerity of the Nottingham

shepherd more than the authority of colleges and the wisdom of philosophers. And now, being in the meridian of life, but a year older than was Locke, when, twelve years before, he had framed a constitution for Carolina, the Quaker legislator was come to the New World to lay the foundation of states."—Hist. U. S., VOL. II, p. 376.

² When near his end, Admiral Penn sent one of his friends to the Duke of York, to desire of him, as a death-bed request, that he would endeavor to protect his son as far as he consistently could, and to ask the king to do the same. Both expressed themselves as his sincere friends, promising their influence in his behalf on all proper occasions.

³ Peter the Great was quite curious to know why the Quakers did not pay respect to great persons, when in their presence, by taking off their hats; and what use they could be in any kingdom, seeing they would not bear arms and fight.—*Clarkson*, VOL. I, p. 6.

⁴ 1 Cor. 13: 7.

a pacificator in war, a firm and undeviating opposer of war in seasons of peace, is literally to honor the example of St. Paul, who was willing to be made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.¹ No man was truly more independent,—but few more meek or humble. The world was only honored when right, though never deserted when wrong.

To defend Penn, *in extenso*, against the charges and insinuations of Chalmers,² or against the dubious compliments of Macaulay,³ is not within the

¹ 1 Cor, 9: 18—23.

² See Annals, pp. 640, 642, 648, &c.

³ "To speak the whole truth concerning him," says Macaulay, "is a task which requires some courage, for he is rather a mythical than a historical person. Rival nations and hostile sects have agreed in canonizing him. England is proud of his name. A great commonwealth beyond the Atlantic regards him with a reverence similar to that which the Athenians felt for Theseus, and the Romans for Quirinus. The respectable society of which he was a member honors him as an apostle. By pious men of other persuasions he is generally regarded as a bright pattern of Christian virtue. Meanwhile admirers of a very different sort have sounded his praises. The French philosophers of the eighteenth century pardoned what they regarded as his superstitious fancies, in consideration for his contempt for priests, and of his cosmopolitan benevolence, impartially extended to all races and to all creeds. His name has thus become, throughout all civilized countries, a synonyme for probity and philanthropy."—*Macaulay*, Vol. I, p. 507.

"Nor is this reputation," he adds, "altogether unmerited. Penn was, without doubt, a man of eminent virtues. He had a strong sense of religious duty, and a fervent desire to promote the happiness of mankind. On one or two points of high importance he had notions more correct than were in his day common, even among men of enlarged minds; and, as the proprietor and legislator of a province, which, being almost uninhabited when it came into his possession, afforded a clear field for moral experiments, he had the rare good

fortune of being able to carry his theories into practice without any compromise, and yet without any shock to existing institutions. He will always be mentioned with honor as the founder of a colony who did not, in his dealings with a savage people, abuse the strength derived from civilization; and as a lawgiver, who, in an age of persecution, made religious liberty the corner-stone of a polity. But his writings and his life furnish abundant proofs that he was not a man of strong sense. He had no skill in reading the characters of others. His confidence in persons less virtuous than himself led him into great errors and misfortunes. His enthusiasm for one great principle sometimes impelled him to violate other great principles which he ought to have held sacred. Nor was his integrity altogether proof against the temptations to which it was exposed in that splendid and polite, but deeply-corrupted society, with which he now mingled. The whole court was in a ferment with intrigues of gallantry and intrigues of ambition. The traffic in honors, places and pardons, was incessant. It was natural that a man who was daily seen at the palace, and who was known to have free access to majesty, should be frequently importuned to use his influence for purposes which a rigid morality must condemn. The integrity of Penn had stood firm against obloquy and persecution. But now, attacked by royal smiles, by female blandishments, by the insinuating eloquence and delicate flattery of veteran diplomatists, and courtiers, his resolution began to give way. Titles and phrases, against which he had often borne his testimony, dropped occasionally from his lips and his pen. It would be well if he had been guilty of

province of the present work. It is but just, however, that their views should be considered and understood by the political student, inasmuch as the subject of their remarks belongs to the political history of America. Chalmers was a tory; and the reader of his allusions to Penn will be at no loss to discover his disposition to prepossess others in respect to opinions which he had the assurance to hint, without showing a corresponding ability either to commend or to prove.

Macaulay endeavors to practise a courage which he supplicates as necessary to his task; and yet, his admissions and concessions are more favorable to Penn than his statements and conclusions are against him. Because Penn could not succeed in all cases where he was an earnest adviser of the right, it does not follow that he should be made responsible for the wrong to which he gave no sanction. He filled no official station, and was only one of many advisers at court; and it is not pretended by any writer that he assumed to exert more than his share of influence. At no time the originator of iniquitous plans, it is not a generous spirit that would render him accountable for their execution, when his only connection with their authors sprang from the high and commendable motive of meliorating evils which he had not the power to prevent. It is with no purpose to exempt him from the common lot of humanity, the liability to commit errors, that a high position is claimed for him as a man of talents, and that opinions are expressed favorable to his undoubted integrity. Such conclusions are warranted by the facts of history, and they are in harmony with those peculiar manifestations of mind for which their subject became so distinguished. But an instructive defence of Penn is to be found in his own letter to Popple.¹ It was not written with

nothing worse than such compliances with the fashions of the world. Unhappily, it cannot be concealed that he bore a chief part in some transactions condemned not merely by the rigid code of the society to which he belonged, but by the general sense of all honest men. He afterwards solemnly protested that his hands were pure from illicit gain, and that he never received any gratuity from those whom he had obliged, though he might easily, while his influence at court lasted, have made a hundred and twenty thousand pounds. To this assertion full credit is due. But bribes may be offered to vanity as well as to cupidity, and it is impossible to deny that Penn was cajoled into bearing a part in some unjustifiable transactions, of which others enjoyed the profits."—Read Macaulay, and Forster's

reply, in pamphlet published by Henry Longstreth, Philadelphia.

¹ William Popple was Secretary to the Lords Commissioners for the Affairs of Trade and Plantations. The following extracts from the letter of Popple will enable the reader to judge of its nature. These extracts are made from the commencement and the close of the letter, as showing the wishes of the writer, the other portion being a recital of various speculations and charges alluded to by Penn in his reply. The letter was addressed "to the Honorable WILLIAM PENN, Esq., Proprietor and Governor of Pennsylvania.

"HONORED SIR:

"Though the friendship with which you are pleased to honor me doth afford me suffi-

any calculating motives in regard to policy. It was simply an offering to friendship, and made without compromising the true dignity of principle. It should be read as an act of justice to its author, as a key to his character, and as a document fraught with instruction. It asserts "an impartial liberty of conscience;" and, if his requisitions upon humanity are deemed in some respects incompatible with the necessities of an efficient government, or are regarded as impracticable in the nature of things, it will not be denied

cient opportunities of discoursing with you upon any subject, yet I choose rather at this time to offer unto you some reflections which have occurred to my thoughts in a matter of no common importance. The importance of it doth primarily and directly respect yourself and your own private concerns; but it also consequently and effectually regards the king, his government, and even the peace and settlement of this whole nation. I entreat you, therefore, to bear with me, if I endeavor in this manner to give somewhat more weight unto my words than would be in a transient discourse, and leave them with you as a subject that requires your retired consideration.

"You are not ignorant that the part you have been supposed to have had of late years in public affairs, though without either the title or honor or profit of any public office, and that especially your avowed endeavors to introduce among us a general and inviolable liberty of conscience in matters of mere religion, have occasioned the mistakes of some men, provoked the malice of others, and in the end have raised against you a multitude of enemies, who have unworthily defamed you with such imputations as I am sure you abhor. This, I know, you have been sufficiently informed of, though I doubt you have not made sufficient reflection upon it.

"The consciousness of your own innocence seems to me to have given you too great a contempt of such unjust and ill-grounded slanders; for, however glorious it is and reasonable for a truly virtuous mind, whose inward peace is founded upon that rock of innocence, to despise the empty noise of popular reproach, yet even that sublimity

of spirit may sometimes swell to a reprovable excess. To be steady and immovable in the prosecution of wise and honest resolutions, by all honest and prudent means, is indeed a duty that admits of no exception; but, nevertheless, it ought not to hinder that, at the same time, there be also due care taken of preserving a fair reputation. 'A good name,' says the wise man, 'is better than precious ointment.' * *

"I could not but be much affected to see any such person fall innocently and undeservedly under such unjust reproaches as you have done. It is a hard case, and I think no man that has any bowels of humanity can reflect upon it without great relents.

"Since, therefore, it is so, and that something remains yet to be done—something more express, and especially more public, than has yet been done—for your vindication, I beg of you, dear sir, by all the tender efficacy that friendship, either mine or that of your friends and relations together, can have upon you; by the due regard which humanity, and even Christianity, obliges you to have to your reputation; by the duty you owe unto the king; by your love to the land of your nativity, and by the cause of universal religion and eternal truth, let not the scandal of insincerity that I have hinted at, lie any longer upon you, but let the sense of these obligations persuade you to gratify your friends and relations, and to serve your king, your country and your religion, by such a public vindication of your honor as your own prudence, upon these suggestions, will now show you to be most necessary and most expedient."

that he affords a shining example of a democratic spirit, which, if not always connected with truth, may sometimes tend to alleviate the evils of error, without adding to the means of its perpetuation.

On receiving this letter, Penn did not take time to consult friends, to study expediency, nor to inquire how he might best define his position and conciliate public opinion. The reply was immediately written and sent to his worthy friend.

"It is now above twenty years," says he, "I thank God, that I have not been very solicitous what the world thought of me; for, since I have had the knowledge of religion from a principle¹ in myself, the first and main point with me has been to approve myself in the sight of God through patience and well-doing, so that the world has not had weight enough with me to suffer its good opinion to raise me, or its ill opinion to deject me. And if that had been the only motive or consideration, and not the desire of a good friend in the name of many others, I had been as silent to thy letter as I used to be to the idle and malicious shams of the times; but, as the laws of friendship are sacred with those that value that relation, so I confess this to be a principal one with me, not to deny a friend the satisfaction he desires, when it may be done without offence to a good conscience."

That a colony founded by a man of such noble views and sentiments, so distinguished for his charity and love of peace, should be made the field for perpetual contests in regard to rights and interests, is a curious, and, it may be added, an instructive fact. To travel through its history is denominated by Franklin "a disagreeable journey." It acquired for itself the unenviable reputation of being the most unmanageable colony in America.² Its

¹ He means the spirit in man, which is illuminated by the spirit of God, so that the more the former bows itself for instruction to the latter, the more the man advances, both inwardly and outwardly, to a holy life.—*Clarkson*.

² Gov. Morris, in his message to the Assembly, 1755, thus concludes:

"In fine, gentlemen," said he, "I must remind you that, in a former message, you said you were a plain people, that had no joy in disputation. But let your minutes be examined for fifteen years past, not to go higher, and in them will be found more artifice, more time and money spent in frivolous controversies, more unparalleled abuses of your governors, and more undutifulness to the crown, than in all the rest of his majesty's colonies put together. And,

while you continue in such a temper of mind, I have very little hopes of good, either for his majesty's service, or for the defence and protection of this unfortunate country."—*Sparks' Franklin*, Vol. III, p. 408.

The passage alluded to by the governor, in regard to the members of the Assembly being "a plain people," was in the following language: "On the whole, while we find the governor transforming our best actions into crimes, and endeavoring to render the inhabitants of Pennsylvania odious to our gracious sovereign and his ministers, to the British nation, to all the neighboring colonies, and to the army that is to come to protect us, we cannot look upon him as a friend to this country. *We are plain people*, unpractised in the sleights and arti-

early history was written by Franklin, and first published in London in 1759.¹ It is written with the earnest spirit natural to an American, and must be classed as one of Franklin's most masterly productions.

Numerous extracts from public documents and the Assembly journals are given as the basis of remark; and no one, who is acquainted with the extraordinary comprehensiveness and clearness of the views of Franklin, requires to be told that the conclusions drawn from the premises are not only philosophical, but highly interesting and instructive.² The Democracy of Frank-

ices of controversy, and *have no joy in disputation*. We wish the governor of the same disposition: and when he shall, as we hope he will, on better consideration, alter his conduct towards us, and thereby convince us that he means well to the province, we may then be able to transact the public business together with comfort both to him and ourselves; of which, till then, we have small expectation." — *Sparks' Franklin*, VOL. III, p. 354.

And in direct reply to his charges, the Assembly say:

"The minutes are printed, and in many hands, who may judge, on examining them, whether any abuses of governors and undutifulness to the crown are to be found in them." * * * "As to frivolous controversies, we never had so many of them as since our present governor's administration, and all raised by himself; and we may venture to say that, during that one year scarce yet expired, there have been more 'unparalleled abuses' of this people and their representatives in Assembly than in all the years put together since the settlement of the province." *Ib.*, VOL. III, p. 408.

¹ This was entitled "An Historical Review of Constitution and Government of Pennsylvania, from its origin, so far as regards the several points of controversy which have from time to time arisen between the several Governors of Pennsylvania and their several Assemblies. Founded on authentic documents." — *Ib.*, VOL. III, pp. 105-567.

² In speaking of this "*Historical Review*," by Franklin, Sparks says:

"The controversies, which existed for many years, between the proprietary gov-

ernors and the Assemblies of Pennsylvania, are not without interest as an important branch of the general history of the country, and as showing the determined spirit of the people in their struggles for liberty. As a member of the Assembly for many years, and one of the leaders, Franklin had taken a conspicuous part against the proprietaries; and, when it was at last resolved by the popular party to apply to the king in council for a redress of their grievances, he was appointed their agent to manage the affair. He went to England, for that purpose, in the summer of 1757. To aid the object of his mission, to counteract the powerful efforts made against the petition by the friends of the proprietaries, and to remove the prejudices then existing in England unfavorable to the people of Pennsylvania, he drew up and published this book in London. It produced a strong impression, and called forth elaborate answers from his opponents. It was the subject of a commendatory article in the *Monthly Review* for July, 1759. In his remarks upon it the writer says: 'It must be confessed that the Pennsylvanians have, in our author, a most zealous and able advocate. His sentiments are manly, liberal, and spirited; his style close, nervous, and rhetorical. His introduction is well calculated to warm his readers in behalf of liberty, of which he boasts his clients to have been the brave assertors. By a forcible display of oppressions they have sustained, he inclines into pity their condition; by an enumeration of their virtues, he endeavors to remove the idea which many have conceived of their unimportance.'

"In the *Critical Review* for August of the same year, the book fell into the hands

lin was as earnest and true as his genius was practical and brilliant.

The controversies between the proprietaries, governors and successive

of the opposite party; and, although it is treated with respect, yet it is censured for the tone it assumes in regard to the demands of the Pennsylvanians. 'Nay,' says the reviewer, 'our author seems to carry his notions of liberty and independence so high, as to admit of no check or control from the government of his mother country.'

* * * * *

"The value of the work, as an historical composition, will be estimated differently, according to the bias of the reader's mind in regard to the disputed points on which it treats. It was professedly written to sustain the aims of a party, and in this light it cannot be looked upon as free from partiality. A large portion of the work, however, consists of **FACTS**, stated with precision, and with such minuteness of citation as to verify their accuracy. **THESE FACTS CANNOT BE CONTROVERTED.** The reasonings and deductions from them would, of course, take a direction in conformity with the author's personal convictions and designs.

"Every page bears witness to his sincerity, and to the deep interest he felt in the cause of liberty and justice, which his countrymen had intrusted to his charge. *

* * The author is accused of having touched the name of the great founder of Pennsylvania with too rude a hand. If it be so, time has repaired the injury. Facts must have their own weight, because they are unchangeable and ever-during; but the memory of William Penn cannot be tarnished by unfounded imputations, nor his character wounded by misdirected darts of party zeal."—*Ib.*, VOL. III, p. 107.

Franklin had no motive to asperse the character of Penn. He simply and boldly vindicated the rights of the people, and at the same time clearly pointed out the sources of their troubles. *Proprietary government* was the subject of his remark; and that he cannot be justly complained of for any excess of Democracy may be inferred from the nature of the remedy which he approves as calculated to relieve

the people,—“a measure,” he says, “that had often been proposed in former Assemblies,—a measure that every proprietary province in America had, from the same causes, found themselves obliged to take,—and a measure that had happily succeeded wherever it was taken. I mean the recourse to an immediate *royal government*.”

When Franklin, by a small majority, lost his seat in the Assembly, which he had held for fourteen years, having been annually elected, it was found, when the Assembly met, notwithstanding this defeat, that his friends and the friends of his measures outnumbered the proprietary party. He was again appointed to resume his agency in England, and to take charge of a petition to the king. The minority protested, giving their reasons against his appointment. To this protest he made a reply, written at the moment the author was preparing to leave for Europe. (VOL. IV, p. 148.) The following extract will tend to illustrate his true position and motives:

"But I have, you say, a 'fixed enmity to the proprietaries,' and 'you believe it will preclude all accommodation of our disputes with them, even on just and reasonable terms.' And why do you think I have a fixed enmity to the proprietaries? I have never had any personal difference with them. I am no land-jobber, and therefore have never had anything to do with their land office or officers. If I had, probably, like others, I might have been obliged to truckle to their measures, or have had like causes of complaint. But our private interests never clashed, and all their resentment against me, and mine to them, has been on the public account. Let them do justice to the people of Pennsylvania, act honorably by the citizens of Philadelphia, and become honest men. My enmity, if that's of any consequence, ceases from the '*very moment*,' and, as soon as I possibly can, I promise to love, honor, and respect them." —*Ib.*, VOL. IV, p. 150.

Assemblies of Pennsylvania,—controversies which so often embarrassed, dis-

That he held his opinions of proprietary governments and proprietary governors irrespective of persons, will be seen by the pertinent language of the following paragraph:

"It is by this time apparent enough, that, though the proprietary and popular interests spring from one and the same source, they divide as they descend; that every proprietary governor, for this reason, has two masters,—one who gives him his commission, and one gives him his pay; that he is on his good behavior to both; that, if he does not fulfil with rigor every proprietary command, however injurious to the province or offensive to the Assembly, he is recalled; that if he does not gratify the Assembly in what they think they have a right to claim, he is certain to live in perpetual broils, though uncertain whether he shall be enabled to live at all; and that, upon the whole, to be a governor upon such terms, is to be the most wretched thing alive."—*Ib.*, VOL. III, p. 187.

He could see more nationality in a king who protected property as a sovereign, than in a governor who protected property as an owner. He could see more safety in a ruler who derived his strength from his subjects, that he might be able to sustain them in their just rights, than in a governor whose power was based on his interests, and whose highest motives would not unfrequently be those of mere policy. He became afterwards, as all men know, an *active partisan* against the king and his government. He was not opposed to the king and his advisers *personally*, but to *their oppressions*. In both cases he showed himself to be a true DEMOCRAT, and in both cases a true friend to the people.

In his article entitled "*Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs*" (1764), Franklin, in speaking of the disputes between the proprietaries and the people, says:

"It is a fact known to us all that such disputes there are, and that they have long

subsisted, greatly to the prejudice of the province, clogging and embarrassing all the wheels of government, and exceedingly obstructing the public defence, and the measures wisely concerted by our gracious sovereign for the common security of the colonies. I may add it as another fact, that we are all heartily tired of these disputes.

"It is very remarkable that disputes of the same kind have arisen in *all* proprietary governments, and subsisted till their dissolution. All were made unhappy by them, and found no relief but in recurring finally to the immediate government of the crown. Pennsylvania and Maryland are the only two of the kind remaining, and both at this instant agitated by the same contentions between proprietary interest and power and popular liberty. Through these contentions the good people of that province are rendered equally unhappy with ourselves; and their proprietary, perhaps, more so than ours; for he has no Quakers in his Assembly to saddle with the blame of those contentions, nor can he justify himself with the pretence that turning to the church has made his people his enemies.

"Pennsylvania had scarce been settled twenty years (not even so long) when these disputes began between the first proprietor and the original settlers. They continued, with some intermissions, during his whole life. His widow took them up, and continued them after his death. Her sons resumed them very early, and they still subsist." * * * "I suspect, therefore, that the cause is radical, interwoven in the constitution, and so become the very nature of proprietary governments, and will therefore produce its effects as long as such governments continue." * * * —*Ib.*, VOL. IV, pp. 79, 80.

"Our wise first proprietor and founder was fully sensible of this; and, being desirous of leaving his people happy, and preventing the mischiefs that he foresaw must in time arise from that circumstance, if it was continued, he determined to take it

tracted and endangered the public service,—were so numerous,¹ complicated and tedious, that a recital of their details could hardly be justified in this connection, either as a gratification to historical curiosity, or as affording any new illustration of principles. The language of Franklin was no exaggeration, when he denominated the review of their history “a disagreeable journey.” The Assembly, deputy governor and council, were in positions of perpetual variance.² The protracted absence of Penn³ from the province rendered a deputy governor necessary and nearly permanent, and, although no laws had been proposed to the Assembly but with the most open and liberal

away, if possible, during his own lifetime. They accordingly entered into a contract for the sale of the proprietary right of government to the crown, and actually received a sum in part of the consideration. As he found himself likely to die before that contract (and with it his plan for the happiness of his people) could be completed, he carefully made it part of his last will and testament, devising the right of the government to two noble lords, in trust, that they should release it to the crown.”—*Ib.*, p. 125.

The colonial expenditures of Penn, his many acts of private munificence, his occasional subjection to the note-shavers, had so impaired his means, that, in 1709, he was compelled to borrow six thousand six hundred pounds,—about thirty thousand dollars,—and secure the loan by a mortgage of the province. This loan was mostly made up by his religious brethren. The transaction alluded to by Franklin was with Queen Anne, 1712, for the transfer of the government of the province and territory to the crown, for which he was to receive twelve thousand pounds. A bill for the purpose was introduced into Parliament, and a small portion of the money advanced. The “noble lords” referred to were Earls of Oxford, Mortimer, and Pawlet.

¹ In opposing the petition for a royal government, “the *wiser and better* part of the province” (self-styled), the proprietary party, venture to say, “that this province (except from the Indian ravages) enjoys the *most perfect internal tranquillity*.” After showing the unpardonable error of such a remark, Franklin concludes with the following characteristic expression: “Al-

most as well might ships, in an engagement, talk of ‘the most perfect tranquillity between two broad-sides.’”—*Ib.*, Vol. IV. p. 137.

² The following manifestation, on the part of the Assembly, addressed to Gov. Morris, affords a specimen of their occasional spirit of independence:

“We are now to take our leave of the governor; and, indeed, since he hopes no good from us, nor we from him, it is time we should be parted. If our constituents disapprove our conduct, a few days will give them an opportunity of changing us by a new election; and, could the governor be as soon and as easily changed, Pennsylvania would, we apprehend, deserve much less the character he gives it, of an unfortunate country.” These words were not uttered with any desire to irritate the governor, nor with any inward satisfaction that they could be used with impunity. They were used in reply to language of a much more exceptionable character, on the part of the governor to the representatives of the people.

³ In a letter to a friend in America, 1689, he says: “Europe looks like a sea of trouble. Wars are like to be all over it, this summer. I strongly desire to see you before it be spent, if the Lord will; and I can say, in his sight, that to improve my interest with King James for tender consciences, and that a Christian liberty might be legally settled, though against my own interest, was that which has separated me from you chiefly.”

In alluding to the absence of Penn, Franklin says: “His nursing colony was yet in the cradle while it was thus deserted;

motives of the proprietary, yet the exercise of his reserved discretion was inconsistent with his declaration of principles. The deputy, it is true,¹ was clothed with his master's power, but not invested with his master's spirit. He was advised of his wishes, but he was not equal to the exertion of his will. He could represent his firmness, but not his charity. He could declare his Democracy, but he could not practise its principles. He had his instructions in his pocket, but the throbbings of the generous heart that dictated them were separated from the motives by which they were approved; and the soul of the author was lost in the agent, or in the cupidity of his successors.

The deputy governor, in his endeavors literally to heed the bond of the flesh, disregarded the voice of the spirit; and, while there was no want of earnestness to follow the letter, there appeared to be but little capacity to comprehend the principle. The original charter was discussed, amended, practically annulled, and renewed. New charters were framed, with new conditions, new promises, and impracticable privileges. The laws of Pennsylvania were declared in opposition to the constitution of England, and the birthright of the British subject was lost in the executive of the province. The rights of the people were invaded by the deputy governor under cover of proprietary instructions;² and, from the first to the last, the democratic Assemblies acted more on the defensive than with any factious motives unfavorable to progress. Official communications were embittered by criminations and

consequently stood in need of all expedients to facilitate its growth, and all preservatives against disorders."

¹ "Plantation-governors," says Franklin, "were frequently transient persons, of broken fortunes, greedy of money, destitute of all concern for those they governed, often their enemies, and endeavoring not only to oppress but defame them, and thereby render them obnoxious to their sovereign, and odious to their fellow-subjects."—*Sparks' Franklin*, Vol. III, p. 447.

² The right of proprietaries to give private instructions to their deputies was a subject much discussed in the Assembly of Pennsylvania. The absurdity of such an assumption, where a charter had been granted and received, and where laws were to be enacted in accordance with the provisions of that charter, and not against the spirit of the constitution of England, is almost self-evident. On this subject, the

Assembly thus conclude a message to the governor:

"Upon the whole, from what we have said, we presume it evidently appears that proprietary instructions and restrictions upon their governors, as they have occasionally been made a part of the public records at different times, have been judged and resolved by our governor, council and the representatives of the people, either—
1. Inconsistent with the legal prerogative of the crown settled by act of Parliament.
2. Or, a positive breach of the charter of privileges to the people.
3. Or, absurd in their conclusions, and therefore impracticable.
4. Or, void in themselves. Therefore, whenever the governor shall be pleased to lay his proprietary instructions before us for our examination, and if then they should appear to be of the same kind as heretofore, his good judgment should lead him to conclude that such 'considerations in life' as our allegiance to the crown, or

recriminations, and the usual courtesies of discussions gave way to the abusive epithets of passion. The governor was accused of bribery,¹ the Assembly of treason.² The one was characterized as indecent, the other as disrespectful. The advice of the Assembly was opposed when offered, and disregarded when asked. Governors became dictators, and demanded action upon information which they withheld, and instructions in secret became laws by proclamation. They discovered haste in the violation of principle, and apathy in responding to the requisitions of duty. The government became "eccentric and unnatural."³ Immoralities were said to abound everywhere, and vice was encouraged by examples of the rulers, instead of

the immediate safety of the colony, &c., are sufficient inducements for him to disobey them, notwithstanding any penal bonds to the contrary, we shall cheerfully continue to grant such further sums of money for the king's use as the circumstances of the country may bear, and in a manner we judge least burthensome to the inhabitants of this province."—*Ib.*, Vol. III, p. 316.

¹ In reply to the governor concerning the expediency of showing a due regard to the proprietaries and their interest, the Assembly comment as follows: "That is, as we understand it, though the proprietaries have a deputy here, supported by the province, who is, or ought to be, fully empowered to pass all laws necessary for the service of the country; yet, before we can obtain such laws, we must facilitate their passage by paying money for the proprietaries which they ought to pay, or in some other shape make it their particular interest to pass them. We hope, however, that if this practice has ever been begun, it will never be continued in this province; and that, since we have an undoubted right to such laws, we shall always be able to obtain them from the goodness of our sovereign, without going to market for them to a subject."—*Ib.*, Vol. III., p. 342.

² The deputy governors constantly assumed the authority to dictate to the Assembly the manner of raising money and making appropriations. The Assembly as constantly resisted the exercise of such a power. In reply to Gov. Hamilton respecting this right, the Assembly employed the

following emphatic language: "The House are not inclined to enter into any dispute with the governor on the subject of his proposed amendments to the money bill, as the representatives of the people have an undoubted right to judge and determine not only of the sum to be raised for the use of the crown, but of the manner of raising it."

At a subsequent period, when Gov. Morris allowed his passion to cloud his judgment in the discussion of this subject with the Assembly, he said: "The offering money in a way and upon terms that you very well knew I could not, consistent with my duty to the crown, consent to, is in my opinion, trifling with the king's commands, and amounts to a refusal to give at all; and I am satisfied will be seen in this light by my superiors; who, by your bill above-mentioned, which I shall lay before them, and by the whole of your conduct since you have been made acquainted with the designs of the French (against the English colonies), will be convinced that your resolutions are and have been to take advantage of your country's danger to aggrandize and render permanent your own power and authority, and to destroy that of the crown. That it is for this purpose, and to promote your scheme of future independency, you are grasping at the disposition of all public money, and at the power of filling all the offices of government, especially those of the revenue," &c.—*Spark's Franklin*, Vol. II, p. 342.

³ *Ib.*, Vol. III, p. 422.

being checked by their authority.¹ The conservative party was content with no control but that of tyranny; and the sprit of royalty was invoked, as more liberal than that of Mammon. It had no grace to offer,—it saw nothing to approve. Freedom was either too great, or restraint too little. Justice was either too distant, or government too weak. In its policy monopolies were the first to be protected,—the people the last to be considered. Liberty was to be made subservient to property. All property was to be taxed but that the of proprietaries,² and protection was to be extended to the rich

¹ In their long statement of grievances to the proprietary (1704) the Assembly say: "And we further entreat that effectual care be taken for the suppression of vice, which, to our great trouble, we have to acquaint thee, is more rife and common amongst us since the arrival of thy deputy and son, especially of late, than was ever known before. Nor are we capable to suppress it, whilst it is connived at, if not encouraged, by authority; the mouths of the more sober magistrates being stopped by the said late order about oaths, and the governor's licensing ordinaries not approven by the magistrates of the city of Philadelphia, and the roast chiefly ruled by such as are none of the most exemplary for virtuous conversation." "The loose conduct and dissipated life of Evans" (deputy governor 1708-4 to 1708-9), says Hildreth, "who had as a companion for his revels William Penn the younger, the proprietary's eldest son, gave the complainants a decided advantage. Penn ascribed his son's ruin to his residence in Pennsylvania; and that son publicly renounced Quakerism, giving for a reason the ingratitude of the colonists toward his father."—VOL. II, p. 244.

² When it was represented by the deputy governors that a tax was necessary for the defence of the province against immediate and threatening dangers, they claimed that the proprietaries should be exempted from paying their proportion of it. "The Assembly," says Franklin, "found the proprietaries in possession of an immense estate, in lands and quit-rents. This estate was as much endangered as any other estate, and was to be defended in common with the rest. They did not think the

immensity of it gave it any title to any exemption of any kind, and they found no such exemption specified in any of their charters.

"Proceeding, therefore, by the rules of reason and equity, as well as policy, they taxed the whole land alike; and subjected the proprietaries, as landholders, to a proportional share of all the claims and impositions which their deputy would have exempted them from as governors-in-chief, and was so strenuous for imposing on the people alone;—and this one bitter ingredient was *mors in olla*,—death in the pot."—VOL. III, p. 371.

"On one side was the proprietary family," says Day, "with their feudal prerogatives, their manors of ten thousand acres, their quit-rents and baronial pomp, alienated in their sympathies from the colony, preferring the luxuries of aristocratic life in England to the unostentatious manners of the New World, ruling the colony by capricious deputies, and ever refusing to be taxed for the common defence of the country. On the other side was a hardy and enthusiastic band of colonists, free in this New World to develop the great principles of civil liberty, then just dawning upon the human mind; willing to bear their share of the primary burdens of the frontier wars against the encroachments of the French, provided the proprietaries would consent to be equally taxed; a part of them burning to take up arms in defence of the colony, while the Quakers and other non-resistant sects were equally zealous to promote peace."—*Hist. Coll. Pa.*

It was decided, in 1762, that the proprietary estates should be taxed. Thus

at the expense of the poor. The majority were to have no honor; the people no position in comparison with gentlemen of rank; and representatives were to be reduced, and yet no complaints were deemed reasonable,—no petitions for reforms respectable.

But this dismal exhibition of party warfare,—of an oligarchy against a Democracy,—had its cheering aspects, its redeeming principles, its happy results.

Though severely tried by the tyranny of the governors, the people were patient, true, and firm.¹ Their good will was above the influences of passion, and their sense of justice superior to a vindictive policy. The Assembly was permanently democratic. Prompt to coöperate in all measures of reform, to require the administration of justice, to protect the rights and interests of the colonists, to hold sacredly the prerogatives of conscience,—the charter of the colony, and the magna charta of England,—they did not hesitate boldly to declare their principles, to oppose monopolies, to repel the presumptions of aristocracy, and at all times to prefer essential liberty to temporary safety.² They were true to the best good of their country and to themselves, and their posterity will not fail to be true to them. That they occasionally committed errors is not to be denied. Comparatively, their errors were slight and seldom. They were rather those of passion, provoked by acts of oppression, than of a selfish spirit against common equity or the acknowledged principles of justice.

The history of Pennsylvania demonstrates how much may be accomplished

was taken away a source of contention which had embroiled the Assembly and governors for many years. This was accomplished chiefly by the influence of Dr. Franklin, during his first mission to England.

¹ "It is apparent," says Franklin, "the Assemblies of that province (Pennsylvania) have acted from the beginning on the defensive only." * * * "It is apparent, on the other hand, that these proprietaries have acted an offensive part; have set up unwarrantable claims; have adhered to them by instructions yet more unwarrantable; have availed themselves of the dangers and distresses of the province, and made it their business (at least, their deputies have) to increase the terrors of the times, purposely to unhinge the present system; and, by the dint of assumptions, snares, menaces, aspersions, tumults and every other unfair practice whatsoever, would have

either bullied or wheedled the inhabitants out of the privileges they were born to; nay, they have actually avowed this perfidious purpose, by avowing and dispersing those pamphlets in which the said privileges are insolently, wickedly and foolishly, pronounced repugnant to government, the sources of confusion, and such as, having answered the great end of causing an expeditious settlement, for which alone they were granted, might be resumed at pleasure, as incompatible with the dictatorial power they now challenge and would fain exercise.

"And, this being the truth, the plain truth, and nothing but the truth, there is no need to direct the censures of the public, which, on proper information, are always sure to fall in the right place."—*Sparks' Franklin*, Vol. III, pp. 528, 529.

² In an address from the Assembly to Deputy Gov. Morris occurs the following

by pure good will, and at the same time how much may be lost by mistaking good nature for benevolence, and a theoretic peace for security. The colony was subject to perpetual change in legislation; the adjustments of one day became the topics of dispute the next; and what was wanting in magnitude of interest was amply supplied by the niceties of distinction. The government had been formed in the confidence that virtue would be chosen for its beauty, peace for its enjoyments, and prosperity for its comforts. But the passions of men exist independent of conventional laws. However high the standard of moral purpose, men will be found to stand in relation to all the degrees of the scale, and to represent, in every variety of combination, all the natural tendencies of the soul. As, in the natural world, the rising sun may beam upon a vaulted sky in peace with all the elements, and ride, at its setting, upon the clouds of the tempest,—so, in the universe of truth, the holiest resolutions, with a successful beginning, may encounter error, in the end, for which they were not adapted to combat, and obstacles of a nature beyond their power to remove. In his endeavors to save the colony from the annoyances of individual cupidity, and the convulsions of party spirit, Penn widened the source of their origin by adopting a theory which was in advance of experience, and multiplied new issues by attempting to avoid old ones. His truth was above his wisdom, and his wisdom was above his knowledge. He desired more than he understood, and accomplished less than he designed. His spiritual habits of faith in the goodness of God inspired a benevolent confidence in the goodness of man. He excited jealousy by his equanimity of temper, and by attempting to avoid contention he encountered the spirit of mistrust. In his conceptions of the conditions of national existence, he failed to discover that a causative diversity was compatible with national unity. His plans were too great for his means of execution, and his hopes in the agency of others were measured by the standard of endeavor which existed as a shining light within himself. While living, the government of his colony was chiefly administered by agents of questionable wisdom; and when dead, by kindred successors, more mercenary in character than skilled in public affairs or distinguished for private virtue.

But, as Maryland exhibited Democracy to be controlled by a Papist, as the originator of measures for the consideration of the people,—Pennsylvania gave an example of Democracy in a Quaker, by whom the people were empowered to make legislative propositions for the action of his judgment,

happy passage: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

"There is not in any volume," says Franklin, "the sacred writings excepted, a

passage to be found better worth the veneration of freemen than this; nor could a lesson of more utility have been laid at that crisis before the Pennsylvanians."—Vol.

III, p. 429.

and the exercise of his prerogative. In the one case sovereignty diverged from a single mind to the people ; in the other, it converged from the people to a single mind.¹ In Maryland toleration was a policy ; in Pennsylvania, a principle. One attempted to practice Democracy without admitting a theory that harmonized its principles ; the other endeavored to force a theory embracing elements which rendered its execution impracticable. Both experiments developed the same truths, and exposed the same errors, though in processes commenced in opposite directions, and combining different elements. The people of Maryland, in seeking their interests, felt the restraining hand of their sovereign lord at the beginning, and political progress was slow ; the people of Pennsylvania began with the utmost freedom in the business of their settlement, but did not discover the limits of their sovereignty, in the person of their proprietary, until they combined to exercise their rights, and to demand a field for activity in some proportion to their magnitude. Sovereignty in both cases was based upon property, and weighed down by hereditary conditions ; and laws, however proposed, were subject to the negative of the governor. The founders of both colonies were democratic in their views, but their confidence in theory was greater than their hopes in practice. So far, however, as their practice was in harmony with the principles of Democracy, their plans succeeded, and the people were prosperous and happy. In Maryland the Protestant was taught toleration by a Papist, and in Pennsylvania the necessity of a military defence was taught by a Quaker. Sectarians combined to promote intellectual freedom ; and, while the friends of peace and war united in counsel to lessen the domain of passion, they harmonized conflicting opinions in respect to the active prerogatives of principle. War, in the defence of just rights, was seen to be the conservator of peace ; feudalism surrendered to royalty, and the splendid presumptions of royalty gave way to the plain and undisguised truths of Democracy. In

¹ "But for the hereditary office of proprietary," says Bancroft, "Pennsylvania had been a representative Democracy. In Maryland, the council was named by Lord Baltimore ; in Pennsylvania, by the people. In Maryland, the power of appointing magistrates, and all, even the subordinate executive officers, rested solely with the proprietary ; in Pennsylvania, William Penn could not appoint a justice or a constable. Every executive officer, except the highest, was elected by the people or their representatives, and the governor could perform no public act but with the consent of the council. Lord Baltimore had a revenue

derived from the export of tobacco, the staple of Maryland ; and his colony was burdened with taxes. A similar revenue was offered to William Penn, and declined ; and tax-gatherers were unknown in his province." * * *

Penn "established a Democracy, and was himself a feudal sovereign. The two elements in the government were incompatible ; and, for ninety years, the civil history of Pennsylvania is but the account of the jarring of these opposing interests, to which there could be no happy issue but in popular independence."—VOL. II, pp. 389, 393.

the unnumbered conflicts of party, the triumphs of the people were as glorious as they proved to be complete.

In regard to

MASSACHUSETTS,¹ CONNECTICUT,² AND RHODE ISLAND,³

the three colonies which, at the time of the Revolution, were under charter governments, little will be said in this connection. The principles of the

¹ The first settlement within the territory of Massachusetts was made by the Pilgrims, at Plymouth, December 21, 1620. This settlement was called *Plymouth Colony*, and afterward *Old Colony*, to distinguish it from the Province of *Massachusetts Bay* which was for a time a distinct government. The settlement of the *Province of Massachusetts Bay* commenced in 1628, the birth-year of Salem. In 1629 a royal charter was granted to this colony. In 1630 Boston, Dorchester, Roxbury, Cambridge and Watertown, were settled. In 1634 a representative government was established. In 1643, in consequence of the dangers which threatened the English settlements from the hostilities of the Indians, Dutch and French, the colonies of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut and New Haven, formed themselves into a confederacy, by the name of the *United Colonies of New England*. This union continued forty years. In 1652 the Province of Maine was detached from Massachusetts, but was restored in 1677. In 1680 New Hampshire was detached from Massachusetts. In 1686 the charter of Massachusetts was taken away by James II., and Sir Edmund Andros was sent out from England as Governor of all New England. He proved to be such a tyrant that the people of Boston deposed him in 1689, and sent him to England. The **PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT** assembled June 5, 1689, which was administered under a Council of Safety till 1692, when a new government was organized under a new charter, dated October 7, 1691. This charter, granted by William and Mary, extinguished the Old Colony government, and united Massachusetts,

Plymouth, Maine, Nova Scotia, under one administration.

² The territory of Connecticut was granted by the Council at Plymouth to the Earl of Warwick, in 1630. It was transferred in 1631 to Lord Say and Seal, Lord Brooks and others. In 1633 the Dutch of New Amsterdam built a fort at Hartford, and the English from Plymouth established a trading-house at Windsor the same year. In 1635 a party from Massachusetts Bay settled at Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield. In 1638 Eaton, Davenport and others, from Boston, began the settlement of New Haven, where they established a separate government. In 1689 the towns on the Connecticut which had been under the government of Massachusetts established a government of their own. In 1650 a treaty was made with the Dutch by which the boundaries between the English settlements and the territories of New Amsterdam were adjusted. In 1662 a royal charter was granted to the colony of Connecticut, and New Haven became united to it in 1665. In 1687 Andros went to Hartford, and demanded the charter; but it was conveyed away and hidden in a tree, which was afterwards called *Charter Oak*. The Governor of New York attempted to establish his authority over the militia of this colony, but was promptly resisted by the people.

³ Rhode Island was founded by Roger Williams. Williams was banished by Massachusetts in 1635, and in 1636 he obtained a grant of land from the Indians, and commenced a settlement the same year. It was named the *Providence Plantation*. A perfectly democratic government was

Puritans have already been noticed, and the issues of party will appear in almost every question of policy that was discussed by the colonies in common. The progress of Democracy in New England may be seen in the different charters granted at successive periods. A government by charter implies distinct purposes and character. In these examples, afforded by the charters of the New England colonies, the evidence was not without its reality. When a monarch concedes freedom, upon principle, to men of principle, he lights a fire that can never be quenched,—he surrenders a power that can never be returned.

The great heart of democratic principles was in New England,¹ and from this point they extended to every portion of the continent. Still the object of suspicious fears in England, the people of Massachusetts began their settlement doubting both the king and the Parliament. They asserted a sovereignty in their physical weakness, and defended it in the might of their principles. This sovereignty was multiplied and explained in Rhode Island² and

established. In 1638 Portsmouth was settled by William Coddington and others from Massachusetts. Newport was settled in 1639. The Providence and Rhode Island Plantations, having no charter, were not admitted into the New England confederacy till 1643. A charter was obtained of Parliament, in 1644, which united the two plantations under one government. In 1647 the first General Assembly met at Portsmouth. Charles II. granted a new charter in 1663.

¹ The name of New England was first given, in 1614, by the famous Captain John Smith, to North Virginia, lying between the degrees of forty-one and forty-five. New England was supposed (1621) to be an island, by Cushman and Winslow. Even as late as 1724, the inefficient minister of British America, the Duke of Newcastle, had letters from the department addressed to "the island of New England." (See *Young's Chronicles of the Pilgrims*, pp. 80, 255; *Bancroft*, VOL. IV, p. 19.) New England, as referred to in the text, is intended to embrace only Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire.

² The following "simple instrument," says Professor Knowles, "which combines the principles of a pure Democracy and of unrestricted religious liberty, was the basis

of the first government in Providence," doubtless drawn up by Roger Williams:

"We, whose names are here underwritten, being desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to submit ourselves, in active or passive obedience, to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for public good of the body, in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a township, and such others whom they shall admit into the same, *only in civil things.*"

In 1637-8, when John Clarke and others (nineteen in all) were required to leave Massachusetts, and decided to settle at Aquetneck (now Rhode Island), they made the following declaration: "We, whose names are underwritten, do swear, solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, to incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and, as he shall help us, we submit our persons, lives and estates, unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and to all those most perfect and absolute laws of his given us in his holy word of truth, to be guided and judged thereby."

The first General Assembly met May 19, 1647. They agreed upon a body of laws, chiefly taken from the laws of England.

Connecticut ;¹ and the democrats who were sent away to promote the internal harmony of Massachusetts became the champions of liberty in new circles

In the introduction of this code, the form of government adopted is called "DEMOCRATIC; that is to say, a government held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants." This code of civil regulations thus concludes: "Otherwise than thus, what is herein forbidden, all men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the lambs of the Most High walk, in this colony, without molestation, in the name of Jehovah their God, for ever and ever."

"I have acknowledged" (it was the declaration of Roger Williams), ("and have and shall endeavor to maintain) the rights and properties of every inhabitant of Rhode Island, in peace; yet, since there is so much sound and noise of purchase and purchasers, I judge it not unreasonable to declare the rise and bottom of the planting of Rhode Island in the fountain of it. It was not the price nor money that could have purchased Rhode Island. Rhode Island was obtained by love," &c.—See *Knowles' Roger Williams*.

The second charter, granted by Charles II., 1663, declared that "no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be anywise molested, punished or disquieted, or called in question for any differences in opinion, in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony."

Cotton Mather says (*Magnalia*, b. vii, c. iii, § 12, 1695) that Rhode Island colony "has been a colluvies of Antinomians, Familists, Anabaptists, Antisabbatarians, Arminians, Socinians, Quakers, Ranters,—everything in the world but *Roman Catholics* and true Christians, though of the latter, I hope, there have been more than of the former among them."

Rhode Island will be considered in another connection.

¹ "The fathers of Connecticut," says Trumbull, "as to politics, were republicans. They rejected with abhorrence the doc-

trines of the divine right of kings, passive obedience, and non-resistance. With Sidney, Hampden and other great writers, they believed that all civil power and government was originally in the people. Upon these principles they formed their civil constitutions.—VOL. I, p. 284.

The charter "conferred on the colonists," says Bancroft, "unqualified power to govern themselves. They were allowed to elect all their own officers, to enact their own laws, to administer justice without appeals to England, to inflict punishments, to confer pardons, and, in a word, to exercise every power, deliberative and active. The king, far from reserving a negative on the acts of the colony, did not even require that the laws should be transmitted for his inspection; and no provision was made for the interference of the English government in any event whatever. Connecticut was independent except in name. Charles II. and Clarendon thought they had created a close corporation, and they had really sanctioned a Democracy."—VOL. II, p. 55.

Trumbull intimates that they were early troubled with apprehensions of consolidation. He says: "One of the principal reasons which these colonists assigned for their removing to Massachusetts was, that they should be more out of the way and trouble of a general Governor of New England, who, at this time (1638), was an object of great fear in all the plantations."—(VOL. I, p. 96.) Professor Kingsley says: "The first emigrants to Connecticut considered themselves under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, till, after the settlement of three towns, they formed themselves into an independent body politic. The first planters of New Haven recognized in their acts no human authority foreign to themselves. They appear to have studiously avoided any mention of their native country, or any allusion to the question of allegiance to the King of England. This matter they left to be determined afterwards as circumstances should.

of sovereignty, and stood, as it were, the sentinels of Democracy, to guard the outposts of the Puritans. The vigilance of Democracy is ever in advance of its dangers.¹ Its jealousies give birth to its securities, and its action permanency to possessions. When the people of Massachusetts began to discover new sources of enterprise in extension of territory,² and safety in

render a decision expedient or necessary."

* * * "Soon after their arrival at Quinnipiac, at the close of a 'day of fasting and prayer,' they formed and subscribed what they denominated a 'plantation covenant.' By this instrument they engaged, 'that as in matters that concern the gathering and ordering of a church, so also in all public offices which concern civil order, as choice of magistrates and officers, making and repealing laws, dividing allotments of inheritance, and all things of like nature, they would all of them be ordered by the rules which the Scripture held forth to them.'" * * * "The government thus instituted was, in fact, a pure Democracy, professedly controlled by the great principles of justice and equity, as these principles are illustrated in the book of Revelation." * * * "Property was not required to constitute a voter. Personal character, as developed in church membership, was the only ground on which any individual was admitted to the exercise of political power." According to "the New Haven code, the clergy, so far from having any civil power, could not even perform the marriage ceremony, this being placed exclusively in the hands of the magistrates. The church was organized on principles strictly independent,—a sort of spiritual Democracy, in which, if there were any lords, they were 'lords brethren.'"—See *Kingsley's Hist. Discourse*, 1838.

How Connecticut acquired the reputation of an intolerant legislation, it is difficult to say. It is an error of early origin, and its injustice was asserted by intelligent writers more than a century ago. "It may be said, without fear of contradiction," says Professor Kingsley, "from any one who knows whereof he affirms, that no example can be produced, in the whole history of Christian

nations, where a community unanimous in their religion, and urged by so many inducements to maintain it, have changed their laws, and made every concession desired, more promptly, fully and cheerfully, than the people of Connecticut."—(*Hist. Dis.*, p. 51.) The colonial records of Connecticut fully justify the strong language of Professor Kingsley. See APPENDIX I.

¹ It is an interesting fact, and worthy to be noted, that Cradock proposed, as early as 1629, that "the chief government of the Plantation (of Massachusetts Bay), together with the patent, should be settled in New England." After several deliberate discussions (in London), such a removal was voted. That they feared opposition to such a movement, may be inferred from the circumstance that they were "desired *privately* and seriously to consider" the subject, "and to set down their particular reasons in writing *pro et contra*, and to produce the same to the next General Court."—See *Young's Chronicles of Mass.*, p. 85.

Another example of foresight and prompt action on the part of the Pilgrims, in 1624, was the case of "the minister, Mr. John Lyford, whom a faction of the adventurers send (according to Gov. Bradford) to hinder Mr. Robinson." Lyford was suspected, watched, and detected in a correspondence adverse to the harmony of the colony.—*Ib.*, p. 20.

² In 1639 "the government of Massachusetts," says Marshall, "induced by the rapidity with which the colony had attained to its present strength to form sanguine hopes of future importance, instituted an inquiry into the extent of their patent, with a view to the enlargement of territory."—*Hist. of the Colonies*, p. 108.

toleration, they ceased to be conservative for protection, and no longer delayed their public avowal of confidence in Democracy for progress. Confident in principles, they looked for power in possessions.

In their frequent controversies with the British government, its agents, and party adherents, they were not backward in declaring their rights, nor timid in expressing their opinions. Their controversies not only concerned their own interests, but interests which were common to all the other colonies. In most respects, what concerned one concerned all. Colonial policy gradually became continental, and what commenced in the private circles of the church was transferred to the halls of legislation. Local parties, in respect to interest, were abated; and Democracy began to unite its forces as a party of principle, in respect to freedom. Democracy had commenced the settlement of the continent; it remained for Democracy to extend its principles and to defend them. The progress of Democratic principles, and the accumulating evidence of an organized party in America, were facts hardly perceptible either to the people or to the rulers of England; and as they counted strength in numbers, they entertained no fears. Some prophesied, but no one believed. Some became accusers, but few doubted. Some looked for trouble, but no one predicted resistance. All knew of disputes, but no one anticipated rebellion.¹

It is certainly to be regarded as a favorable circumstance to the cause of freedom, that the colonists were at first looked upon as religionists, rather than politicians; and that they frequently had test questions, in respect to control, which neither secured the sympathy nor excited the hostility of the King, the Church, or the Parliament.

Indeed, the colonists were early reported to government as intolerant conservatives, and but few could have indulged even in moderate apprehensions that their excesses in claiming too much freedom were of any particular consequence anywhere.

It was well understood that there was no particular affection between the Stuarts and the colonists, and a mutual watchfulness between them was to be expected. The colonists were no admirers of monarchy, and they had given frequent occasions for suspicion that they favored republican tendencies. The existing relations between the Church of England and the Puritans were such as to promise no peace where power was in the process of accu-

¹ Jer. Dummer, who wrote "A Defence of the New England Charters," first published in 1721, in reply to apprehensions which had been expressed, "that their (the colonies') increasing numbers and wealth, joined to their great distance from Great Britain, will give them an opportunity, in the course of some years, to throw off their dependence on the nation, and declare themselves a free state, if not curbed in time, by being made entirely subject to the crown,"—thus writes: "Whereas, in truth, there is nobody, though but little acquainted with these, or any of the northern plan-

mulation.¹ Each party had its secret friends to report the doings of its opponents; and both parties were subject to the misrepresentations and exaggerations of zealous men, whose errors, if not in saying too much, could hardly be in saying too little.

The people of Massachusetts did not hesitate to give that construction to their charter which promised most for their own good. They had not been protected by a monarchy,—why should they be scrupulous in continuing its power? They had regarded themselves as the servants of God,—could it be expected that they would recognize a rival master in a king?² If the king and Parliament complained of the assumption of power, the colonists stood upon the justice of their position. If the king asserted his prerogative, the colonists claimed that it was inconsistent with their freedom; if he manifested a formal interest in their welfare, they appealed to principles; if he expressed a paternal relationship, they were grateful for his condescension. Distance was an obstacle which rendered frequent communications impossible; and while monarchy relied upon royalty in England, Democracy was building its home in the hearts of the people of America.

From the first to the last, the colonists found in their charter sufficient authority to warrant the establishment of a separate government; and on no occasion did they consent to modify their views of construction, their conceptions of duty, or neglect to embrace all proper opportunities for the improvement of their position.

It was believed by some that no treaties should be made, except by the people,³ and it was claimed that the people alone should direct and distribute

tations, who does not know and confess that their poverty and the declining state of their trade is so great at present that there is far more danger of their sinking, without some extraordinary support of the crown, than of their ever revolting from it. So that I may say, without being ludicrous, that it would not be more absurd to place two of his majesty's beef-eaters to watch an infant in the cradle, than to cut its father's throat, than to guard these weak infant colonies to prevent their shaking off the British yoke. Besides, they are so distinct from one another in their forms of government, in their religious rites, in their emulation of trade, and consequently in their affections, that they never can be supposed to unite in so dangerous an enterprise."—p. 72.

¹ "Considering the subject from the historical point of view," says Bancroft, "it

must be observed that the establishment of Episcopacy in New England, as the religion of the state, was impossible; since the character of the times was a guarantee that the immense majority of emigrants would prove its uncompromising opponents."—Vol. I, p. 344.

² "Submission," it was argued when it was proposed to alter the charter, 1683, "would be an offence against the majesty of Heaven; the religion of the people of New England and the court's pleasure cannot subsist together." * * * "Better suffer than sin. It is better to trust the God of our fathers than to put confidence in princes."—See *Bancroft*, Vol. II, pp. 125, 126.

³ John Eliot, the benevolent apostle of the Indians, and author of "The Christian Commonwealth," a work condemned for its democracy, claimed for *the people* a voice in making treaties.—See *Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 72.

the executive, judicial and representative powers of the colony. Governors were publicly subjected to be questioned, advised and censured, by the people; the ministers of the gospel were reminded of their errors, and magistrates of their duties. "The people were prized as the riches of the country;" and the remark which was made in Parliament, in the time of George II., "that they who have no property have the strongest property in liberty," was a truth well known and fully applied in practice.

The people declared war against the Indians, and declined war against the Dutch. They enacted laws with a bold spirit, exercised ecclesiastical authority, coined money, and denied the right of appeal to the king¹ and Parliament. Aristocracy was rebuked with fearlessness; and, when spirits were too turbulent for discipline, they were summarily shipped to England. And yet, with such undisguised claims to authority, they based all their hopes in the Christian faith, technically honored their king, but bent the knee to none but God. But in their boldness the colonists were prudent. They well comprehended the loyalty of necessity, and made no impracticable attempts to hasten the growth of their plans. They avoided, as far as possible, all discussions that were of doubtful issue. They looked upon Parliament as an expensive friend; and seldom honored that body by petitions for favor, fearing that the obligation would be remembered to their damage, should their prayers be answered.² To some things proposed by government they yielded, though not without an explanation of terms, and where there was no actual compromise of principle. The troubles and revolutions of the parent country were studied, with a cautious participation in their causes, though not without fearful apprehensions, or pleasing anticipations, according to their wishes or their judgment, of their final issues. At all times respectful, they claimed with serious deliberation the full measure of their rights; and at all times courteous, they declined obedience to requisitions which they believed to be wrong. It may be truly said of them that they were graced with "the pride of submission, and dignity of obedience." They could receive the commissioners of the crown with all the ceremony due to their station, and yet impress them with a sense of their littleness, and the utter futility of their authority.³ They could ship a troublesome

¹ It was accounted perjury and treason to speak of appeals to the king—*Burdett's Letter to Laud*, 1687.

² When some of the friends of Massachusetts, in England, suggested a petition in behalf of that colony to the Long Parliament, soon after its meeting, it was, at first, declined; "on consideration," says Winthrop, "that if we should put ourselves under the protection of Parliament, we

must then be subject to all such laws as they should make, in which course, though they should intend our good, yet it might prove very prejudicial to us."

³ In 1664, Charles II. issued a commission, empowering Richard Nichols and three others "to hear and determine complaints and appeals in causes, as well military and civil as criminal, within New England, and to proceed in all things for

governor home without contempt of the throne, and refuse to drink his majesty's health and hear no breathing of treason. They could hunt the fugitive judges, who had assisted in sending royalty to the scaffold, with the earnestness of "hounds," and like "lobsters"¹ succeeded in finding them.²

settling the peace and security of the country."

This commission was resisted by Massachusetts with extraordinary resolution, as a violation of their charter. The General Court "immediately resolved, in words," says Chalmers, "which show what impression the arrival of the royal officers had made, to bear true allegiance to his majesty, and to adhere to a patent, so dearly obtained, and so long enjoyed by undoubted right in the sight of God and man." A communication was made to the king, stating "the grievances of the colony with the force of men who feared that the power of the commissioners might be improved 'to the subversion of their all.'" And it concluded in this rapturous strain: "Let our government live, our patent live, our magistrates live, our laws and liberties live, our religious enjoyments live,—so shall we all yet have further cause to say, from our hearts, let the king live forever."

The commissioners were not only openly opposed by proclamation, made by authority and preceded by the sound of trumpet, but they were required, with great seriousness, to behave themselves with all proper respect for the laws. It is said that they were accustomed to enjoy themselves with a few friends at a tavern in Ann-street, Saturday nights. This was contrary to a law which required the strict observance of Saturday night as a part of the Lord's day. A constable attempted to break them up, but was beaten and driven off by Sir Robert Carr and his servant. Mason, another constable, immediately proceeded to the tavern; but the party had gone to the house of a merchant near by. Mason went in, staff in hand, and reproached them for resisting an officer, and for such examples of immorality; telling them it was well that they had changed their quarters, or otherwise he should have arrested them all. "What,"

said Carr, "arrest the king's commissioners?" "Yes," answered Mason, "the king himself, had he been there."

The democratic reception of the commissioners in America was the cause of amazement in England. "We are all amazed," said the chancellor (Clarendon), "you demand a revocation of the commission, without charging the commissioners with the least matter of crimes or exorbitances." Boyle echoed the astonishment: "The commissioners are not accused of one harmful thing, even in your private letters." "A century later," says Bancroft, "and there were none in England who did not esteem the commission an unconstitutional usurpation."—See *Bancroft*, Vol. II, p. 83; *Chalmers' Annals*, p. 881.

The commission was not without its good results. It had a tendency to lead the colonists to settle differences at home, and to study their relations with England. Although some of the weaker colonies submitted with an apparent loyalty, the permanent effect of the commission was favorable to freedom.

¹ See Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, p. 635.

² When the royal mandate was received by the Governor of Massachusetts requiring the apprehension of Whalley and Goffe, a feigned search was made for those unhappy men. A commission was given to Thomas Kellond and Thomas Kirk, two zealous young royalists, to go through the colonies, as far as Manhadoes, and make a careful and universal search for them. They proceeded with despatch as far as Hartford, where they were nobly entertained by Gov. Winthrop. He assured them that the judges made no stay in Connecticut, but went directly to New Haven. He gave them a warrant and instructions similar to those which they had received in Massachusetts. All was done with a show of promptness. They arrived next day at Guilford, and

They could beat the drum with respectful impunity in the presence of an unlawful officer who had been sent to rule over them,¹ and immerse his majesty's commissioners in utter darkness without intending personal disrespect.²

opened their business to Deputy Gov. Leet. They acquainted him that they had reasons for believing that the regicides were then in New Haven. They desired immediately to be furnished with powers, horses and assistance, to arrest them. The governor and the principal men of Guilford viewed the judges as among the excellent in the earth, and had no disposition to betray them. They found means to delay the officers until next day, when horses were furnished; but the governor utterly declined giving them any powers before he had consulted his council. The judges were apprized of every transaction respecting them, and they and their friends took their measures accordingly. After meeting his council, the governor declared that they could not act without calling a general assembly of freemen. The officers complained, with earnest professions of loyalty, and said that his majesty would highly resent the concealment and abetting of such traitors and regicides. They demanded whether he and his council would own and honor his majesty. The governor replied, "We do honor his majesty, but have tender consciences, and wish first to know whether he will own us." After the officers had used their best skill to discover the fugitives, by watching and by searching houses, they gave up the pursuit. The whole business was managed by the governor and the people with admirable judgment, and, without any open disloyalty to his majesty, they succeeded in protecting their distinguished visitors.—See *Trumbull's Conn.*, Vol. I, p. 248.

¹ Col. Benjamin Fletcher, Governor of New York in 1692, received a commission which was viewed by the colonists as entirely inconsistent with the charter rights and safety of the colonies. He was vested with plenary powers of commanding the whole militia of the provinces. When

he visited Hartford, and insisted on the command of the Connecticut militia, the Assembly not only refused consent, but Gov. Treat declined receiving a commission from him.

"The train-bands of Hartford assembled," says Trumbull, "and, as the tradition is, while Capt. Wadsworth, the senior officer, was walking in front of the companies, and exercising the soldiers, Col. Fletcher ordered his commission and instructions to be read. Capt. Wadsworth instantly commanded, 'Beat the drums!' and there was such a roaring of them that nothing else could be heard. Col. Fletcher commanded silence. But no sooner had Bayard made an attempt to read again, than Wadsworth commands, 'Drum,—drum, I say!' The drummers understood their business, and instantly beat up with all the art and life of which they were masters. 'Silence! silence!' says the colonel. No sooner was there a pause, than Wadsworth speaks, with great earnestness, 'Drum, drum, I say!' and, turning to his excellency, said, 'If I am interrupted again, I will make the sun shine through you in a moment!' He spoke with such energy in his voice, and meaning in his countenance, that no further attempts were made to read, or enlist men."—Vol. I, p. 393.

² When Sir Edmund Andros, with his *suite* and a body of troops, visited Hartford, to demand the charter of Connecticut, the Assembly was in session. The governor and Assembly had no disposition to treat their distinguished visitor with any disrespect, although they were keenly alive to the injustice of his mission. The important affair was debated and kept in suspense until the evening, when the charter was brought and laid upon the table, where the Assembly was sitting. By this time, great numbers of people were assembled, and men sufficiently bold to enterprise whatever might be necessary or expedient. The lights

Strangers were watched, and watches were set with prayer. New accessions to the throne were declared with a discriminating convenience, and addresses of congratulation were alike tempered with uncompromising independence and confident submission.

To convey to the reader, in a few words, an adequate idea of the variety of disposition, power and temper, manifested by Great Britain towards the colonies during a long period of time, would be quite impossible. Such connecting links will be given as will best serve to illustrate the continuity of Democratic principles in the American colonies before the period of the Revolution.

Although the political importance of America was not early seen by the English government, the political rights of the colonists soon attracted attention in England. The king complained that Protestants were banished to become republicans, and, though Puritans were hopeless subjects, he preferred them to rebellious ones. Still he saw nothing to fear, and but little to control; and the influence of the crown alternated between a liberal policy and a conservative one. National affairs at home were of more pressing importance, and the colonists were seldom noticed, except when they were occasionally brought forward for consideration by interested persons, who had a favor to ask, a complaint to make, or a jealous apprehension of danger to express. Fanaticism was sometimes watched with a paternal feeling of mingled pity and vexation, and measures were ordered for regulating the Puritans in America with similar motives that orders at home were given for keeping the peace. A colonial system had not been conceived in England.

When, however, it was discovered that the colonists were exercising an influence to unite in the defence of common interests, and that they freely expressed opinions favorable to a separate government,—the crown, doubtless moved by a disposition to rebuke assurance, commenced a conservative control. Liberalized charters were modified or cancelled, and the acts of government were directed with an evident purpose to prevent danger by recalling power that had been conceded,—and the right to dictate was fully exercised by the king and the council. Still, with an utter indifference to principles, or profoundly ignorant of consistency in action, the English government pursued, at the same time, a different policy with different colonies. Each colony had its own peculiar conditions of existence and control: and perhaps no two of the whole number enjoyed the same degree of favor.

were instantly extinguished, and one Captain Wadsworth, of Hartford, in the most silent and secret manner carried off the charter, and secreted it in a large hollow tree, fronting the house of the Hon. Samuel Wylls, then one of the magistrates of the

colony. The people appeared all peaceable and orderly. The candles were officiously relighted; but the patent was gone, and no discovery could be made of it, or of the person who had conveyed it away.—See *Trumbull*, Vol. 1, p. 371.

POLITICAL AND NATIONAL PROGRESS.

SUPREMACY OF MIND.

In studying the origin and growth of nations, the student is apt to acquire the habit of looking too much to external events,—as if they were the source, instead of the incidents of progress. This is reversing the order of cause and effect. The primary elements of progress are in the mind, the secondary in nature. The outward field is the world, but man is the discoverer, the inventor, the worker. A review of the past discloses the perfect adaptation of means to ends, and a system of gradual development according to natural laws. It is well to meditate upon the mental relations of historical subjects that proper views of principles may be clearly discerned and defined. Hence, the importance of considering the supremacy of mind.

To the comprehensive mind how full of meaning is the remark of Guizot, that—“After all, whatever external events may be, it is man himself who makes the world.” This leads us to discover and to study the varied means instituted by the will of God and employed by man to advance humanity. The mind—that commonwealth of faculties, endowed with its far-seeing instincts, and dignified with its reason and heaven-born sentiments,—is everywhere to assert its power and to fulfil its mission. Its varied rule constitutes the history of the past, its diversified powers indicate the innumerable and ever changing departments of human labor and fields of glory, and its proud achievements are marked upon the enduring scale of human progress. Its range of activity, though limited and humble for the moment, can neither be bounded by the land-marks of knowledge, nor scanned by the flights of prediction. It travels the most desolate regions of the globe, against threatening dangers and death, and turns upwards its instruments of observation to mark the sublime phenomena of the celestial hemi-

sphere.¹ The invisible mite,² and the towering mountain are alike scrutinized by its gifted eye and magnifying instruments, and all nature, in its parts, and completeness, each in its time and turn become the object of its experiment, and the theme of its contemplation. From the visible to the invisible, it turns to the world of abstraction,—and man, and nature, the nation and the universe—are surveyed in their vast and extended relations,—reaching even the sublime problem of intelligently tracing the great pathway of the soul in its progress from time to eternity.³

In observing the phenomena of the external world, and noting the conditions of growth and developments of power—philosophers have discovered and promulgated a system of fundamental laws. The earth has become the record of its own age and formation, and its teeming products, and every living creature—make a familiar lesson in the family and in the school.⁴ The

¹ Mr. Paravey asserts, that the satellites of Jupiter were known to the Chinese, and figured by them on their celestial charts, and that the use of telescopes has existed among them, from the remotest antiquity.

Although the knowledge of the attracting power of native iron magnets or loadstones appears to be of very ancient date among the nations of the West, there is strong historical evidence in the proof of the striking fact that the knowledge of the directive power of a magnetic needle and of its relation to the terrestrial magnetism was peculiar to the Chinese, a people living in the extremest eastern portions of Asia. More than a thousand years before our era, in the obscure age of Codrus, and about the time of the return of the Heraclidæ to the Peloponnesus, the Chinese had already magnetic carriages, on which the movable arm of a figure of a man continually pointed to the south, as a guide by which to find the way across the boundless grass plains of Tartary; nay, even in the third century of our era, therefore at least seven hundred years before the use of the mariner's compass in European seas, Chinese vessels navigated the Indian Ocean under the direction of magnetic needles pointing to the south.—*Humboldt. Cosmos.*

² *Fairholme* says,—“There are, in almost all fluids, animals as perfect as ourselves in bodily structure and action, so minute, that it would require millions of them to

form the compass of one single grain of sea sand.” He claims to have demonstrated, “in the most unequivocal manner, that it would require from one to three millions of some active animalcula to form the bulk of a grain of sand.”

³ Where all the germs of civilization are developed beneath the ægis of free institutions and wise legislation, there is no cause for apprehending that any one branch of knowledge should be cultivated to the prejudice of others. All afford the state precious fruits, whether they yield nourishment to man and constitute his physical wealth, or whether, more permanent in their nature, they transmit in the works of mind the glory of nations to remotest posterity. The Spartans, notwithstanding their Doric austerity, prayed the gods to grant them “the beautiful with the good.”—*Humboldt. Cosmos.*

⁴ “We cannot survey the crust of our planet,” says Humboldt, “without recognizing the traces of the prior existence and destruction of an organic world. The sedimentary rocks present a succession of organic forms, associated in groups, which have successively displaced and succeeded each other. The different superimposed strata thus display to us the faunas and floras of different epochs. In this sense the description of nature is intimately connected with its history; and the geologist, who is guided by the connection existing

elements are analyzed, the atmosphere and the lightning, though terrible in the thunders of the tornado, are made submissively to carry and to speak, to give music and information. The ocean is measured in its depths, in its conditions of motion and repose, in its capacity of production and subordinate power to serve man in his wants, and nations in their necessities. The forests are explored, and their treasures developed. The rivers are traced in their winding beds, the prairies tilled, and the mountains are shaped and bored for travel. By the aid of science these things are done and made to subserve the individual or the general good,—and hence all the great sources of culture and industry are brought within the compass of ordinary minds to be studied and understood. They are associated with no mystery, they encourage no superstitions. Cause and effect are observed in their obvious relations and with a practical confidence, and results, in all their variety of life and death, power and beauty, aim and end,—are seen to be in harmony with the unchangeable laws of nature, and man ceases to doubt in so far as he ceases to be ignorant. It is when we see the supremacy of mind over matter—that we cannot fail to be impressed with the still greater truth,—the supremacy of truth over error, of right over wrong, of life over death—both in the life of man and in the destiny of nations. Truth may be known by its uniformity and system, by its efficiency and compensations, by its inherent beauty and universal adaptation. Emanating from the great source of all intelligence, all forms of power are to be regarded as but manifestations of its creative will.¹

among the facts observed, cannot form a conception of the present without pursuing, through countless ages, the history of the past." * *

"The sense in which the Greeks and Romans originally employed the word *history* proves that they too were intimately convinced that, to form a complete idea of the present state of the universe, it was necessary to consider it in its successive phases."—*Cosmos*.

¹ "When man began to interrogate nature," says Humboldt, "and, not content with observing, learned to evoke phenomena under definite conditions; when once he sought to collect and record facts, in order that the fruit of his labors might aid investigation after his own brief existence had passed away, the *philosophy of Nature* cast aside the vague and poetic garb in which she had been enveloped from her origin, and, having assumed a severer aspect, she

now weighs the value of observations, and substitutes induction and reasoning for conjecture and assumption." * *

"Nature considered *rationaly*, that is to say, submitted to the process of thought, is a unity in diversity of phenomena; a harmony, blending together all created things, however dissimilar in form and attributes; one great whole animated by the breath of life. The most important result of a rational inquiry into nature is, therefore, to establish the unity and harmony of this stupendous mass of force and matter, to determine with impartial justice what is due to the discoveries of the past and to those of the present, and to analyze the individual parts of natural phenomena without succumbing beneath the weight of the whole. Thus, and thus alone, is it permitted to man, while mindful of the high destiny of his race, to comprehend nature, to lift the veil that shrouds her phenomena, and, as it were, submit the

With a deep and lively consciousness of this knowledge of things, and with an abiding conviction, that what is true of a part cannot be otherwise than true of the whole, let the reader turn from the interests of self to nature and to nature's God, from the individual to the race, from the family to the nation,—and endeavor with the aids of history,—to contemplate humanity in the broad phases of nationality. The nation is an ultimate combination of mind, and its forces are gathered in convention, from the experience and traditions of the past—according to those invisible laws of sympathy and contrariety, which characterize the process of germination at all times—whether of a physical or spiritual nature. The germs of a nation's power and character, like the seed sown by the planter, are self protective, and they spring forth into life in due time and season, though centuries may have intervened between their inception and development. The events of mind, as connected with the growth of nations, indicate the great sources of power, strength and character. From the earliest to the latest periods,—Democracy has been combined with every possible variety of form of power, always seeking its own, lessening the wrong and enlarging the right. It has been denounced as the result of commerce, and as the cause of treason. Whether viewed as cause or effect, its theories have claimed too much to find favor with despotism, and its blessings have proved too general to be mistaken for the fruits of tyranny. Its victories have been limited and temporary, but its influence permanent and progressive. In all ages it has been the conservator of truth, and the careful distributor of authority. What could not be controlled in application, was watched with a vigilant acquiescence, and the mistakes of ignorance, or fanaticism—were left to be corrected in a period more favorable to judicious counsels.

The beginning of a nation is often narrowed down to the circumstances of a people, to the wisdom or foresight of certain men, to the injustice of rulers, to the adoption of a particular form of government, or to a successful revolution.¹ These sources of action are too limited to be satisfactory

results of observation to the test of reason and of intellect.”—*Cosmos*.

¹ In 1765, the people of Ipswich, Mass., gave instructions to their representative, Dr. John Calef, from which the following extract is taken. “When our forefathers left their native country, they left also the laws and constitution they had been under, in all respects and to all purposes, save what was secured by the charters; and it is a manifest fact, that, from that day to this, the government at home have never considered the Colonies as under the force of

that constitution or the laws of that realm. Three things were necessary to have this otherwise; First, that their migrating and coming forth should have been a national act. Secondly, that it should have been at a national expense. Thirdly, that they should be sent to settle some place or territory that the nation had before, in some way or other, made their own, as was usually, if not always the case with the ancient Romans. But neither of them was the case here. It is well known that they came out of their own accord, and at their

to the intelligent reader. They are incidental. A new nation is the offspring of the the entire past. Mind, with an all pervading power, accumulates the agencies of progress, and in its mighty career directs their exertion in new combinations. These combinations, as represented by the nations of ancient and modern times, have been briefly reviewed, and the reader is asked mentally to repossess himself of that vast diversity of elements—which has been disengaged by the civilization of the world, and prepared for a new formation upon the American continent—which territory had been seen and mapped by the Northmen five hundred years before the voyage of Columbus.¹ But it must be considered, that history affords but an imperfect record of the progress of the human mind. The absence of knowledge is a period of darkness, and when it is considered how long mankind were without the means of recording their thoughts and acts, and of transmitting them to posterity by the aid of the printing press,—it may be readily seen how small a portion of human progress is attributable to the agency and intelligence of man, and how much to Providence. It is not to be inferred by the student, that the dark ages were barren of results, or that ages of comparative ignorance,—have afforded no aids to the growth of mind. The legacies of individual character, the characteristics of races and of nations, the maxims of accumulated wisdom, the inextinguishable lights of revelation,—are transmitted and perpetuated in new and living forms, according to unalterable laws, and as it has been demonstrated that not an atom of the physical world can be annihilated, so it may be regarded as still more certain,—that no thought or emotion, enshrined in truth, can be lost in the changes of time.

It is, indeed, enough to command our reverence and awe,—to contemplate what has been visible and intelligible in the dark and enlightened ages. With what moral grandeur and natural sublimity is the beginning of a nation invested—if traced to sources coeval with the age of man. Science,

own expense, and took possession of a country they were obliged to buy or fight for, and to which the nation had no more right than to the moon. Thence it follows that, abating the charter, they were as much dismembered from the government they came from, as the people of any other part of the world.”—*Works John Adams*, Vol. 2, p. 171.

¹ While the Califate still flourished under the Abbassides at Bagdad, and Persia was under the dominion of the Samanides, whose age was so favorable to poetry, America was discovered in the year 1000 by Leif, the son of Eric the Red, by the northern

route, and as far as 41° 30' north latitude. The first, although accidental, incitement toward this event emanated from Norway. Toward the close of the ninth century, Naddod was driven by storms to Iceland while attempting to reach the Färoë Islands, which had already been visited by the Irish. The first settlement of the Northmen was made in 875 by Ingolf. Greenland, the eastern peninsular of a land which appears to be everywhere separated by the sea from America proper, was early seen, although it was peopled from Iceland a hundred years later (988).—*Humboldt. Cosmos.*

with its illustrious votaries—from a Thales to a Franklin; morals, from a Seneca to a Paley; government, from a Solon to a Washington; Christianity, with the sacred teachings of its Divine Founder, and his followers, for two thousand years; the associated and conflicting labors of Reformations, Revolutions, Schools and Institutions,—embracing every variety of thought, theory and action,—all converged by an All-wise Providence to bless and to sanctify the beginning of the American nation, and that nation a Democratic Republic. The people of the American Colonies were exalted to the high privilege of asserting the principles of Democracy, and of testing the practicability of self-government.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A NATION.

As the various faculties make up the mind, or the man, so various men, or classes of men, make up the nation. The aggregate stands as a distinct part of creation, an element in the chemistry of civilization, and is to be counted a fact in history, and may be regarded by itself, or viewed in the successive and varied combinations developed by its progress. The sources of its diversity are the sources of its completeness and power; and such an organization has its distinct mission, and draws its nutriment from the events and changes of the physical and mental worlds as systematically and naturally as plants and trees draw nutrition from the earth.

The forms and growth of nations are governed by fixed laws. They have their natural limits, practicable and impracticable conditions. They have their periods of health and of decay. If their means of protection are not commensurate with their claims of power, anarchy follows, and nationality fails. When continued anarchy prevails government perishes.¹ A nation is an aggregated form of delegated authority, and its power and strength are not entirely self inherent, but are dependent, to a certain degree, on outward circumstances. There are “fixed boundaries to authority,” says Lamartine, “even as there are limits to the human mind, and the world itself, beyond which boundaries lie only death and annihilation.” This is true of all power however created or exerted, limited or extended. A people without a defined or stable government, can have no identity as a nation. “In counsel is stability,” says Solomon, thus enforcing the great truth that a nation cannot endure without wisdom.

¹ Guizot, in speaking of the revolution of 1848,—says,—“So long as this judgment (on principles) is deferred, chaos reigns: and chaos, if prolonged in the midst of a people, would be death. Chaos is now concealed under one word—Democracy.” In this, as in all similar cases,—chaos was concealed by the enemies of Democracy. Louis Napoléon used the word not because he loved its meaning, but to aid him in surreptitiously reëstablishing his family upon a throne.

A nation, like man, is subjected to the fundamental laws of capacity and of principle. It cannot fail by doing right, nor can it succeed by doing wrong. The greater the knowledge of its wants and dependent relations, the surer is its means of independence and prosperity. Its exact conformity to justice, constitutes its means of continued life and safety. "The first requisite toward the foundation of a government by a nation," says Geo. Combe, "is, that it be independent of foreign powers." Though a nation may be independent, the people may not be free. "Thus, France and Spain, under the Bourbon dynasties," continues Combe, "before the French revolution, were both independent; they owned no superior. But they were not free; the people did not enjoy liberty." * * "England has been independent almost since the Romans left the country; for although it was conquered by the Normans, in the year 1066, the conquerors fixed their residence in the vanquished territory, made it their home, and in a few generations were amalgamated with the native population. But England was not properly free till after the revolution in 1688."¹ These great outlines of principle were ably sketched by Burke in the House of Commons in 1775. In a speech favoring conciliation with America,—he points out the sources of a nation's strength, the facts and causes of a nation's weakness, the boundaries of a nation's growth,—and the necessities of a nation's boundaries. He speaks of the "untractable or disobedient spirit" of the Americans, which is the educated spirit of resistance to unlawful oppression,—as an element of strength in the character of a people.

"Permit me, Sir," said he, "to add another circumstance in our colonies, which contributes no mean part toward the growth and effect of this untractable spirit. I mean their education. In no country perhaps in the world is the law so general a study. The profession itself is numerous and powerful; and in most provinces it takes the lead. * * "I hear that they have sold nearly as many of Blackstone's Commentaries in America as in England." * * "This study renders men acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defence, full of resources. In other countries, the people, more simple, and of less mercurial cast, judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance; here they anticipate the evil, and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance; and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze.

"The last cause of this disobedient spirit in the colonies is hardly less powerful than the rest, as it is not merely moral, but laid deep in the natural constitution of things. Three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and them. No contrivance can prevent the effect of this distance, in weakening government. Seas roll, and months pass, between the order and

¹ Moral Philos., pp. 341-2.

the execution : and the want of a speedy explanation of a single point, is enough to defeat a whole system. You have, indeed, winged ministers of vengeance, who carry your bolts in their pounces to the remotest verge of the sea. But there a power steps in, that limits the arrogance of raging passions and furious elements, and says,—“ So far shalt thou go, and no farther.” Who are you, that should fret and rage, and bite the chains of nature? Nothing worse happens to you, than does to all nations, who have extensive empire ; and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies, the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt, and Arabia, and Curdistan, as he governs Thrace ; nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers, which he has at Brusa and Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein, that he may govern at all ; and the whole of the force and vigor of his authority in his centre, is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is, perhaps, not so well obeyed, as you are in yours. She complies too ; she submits ; she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire.”

“ Then, Sir,” he continues, “ from these six capital sources ; of descent ; of form of government ; of religion in the northern provinces ; of manners in the southern ; of education ; of the remoteness of situation from the first mover of government ; from all these causes a fierce spirit of liberty has grown up. It has grown with the growth of the people in your colonies, and increased with the increase of their wealth ; a spirit, that unhappily meeting with an exercise of power in England ; which, however lawful, is not reconcilable to any ideas of liberty, much less with theirs, has kindled this flame, that is ready to consume us.”¹

Thus—how utterly insignificant is the despotism of a nation made to appear when compared to the democracy of nature.

How far a nation may be able to preserve its identity, or its integrity to itself, by war, is a subject entitled to careful research and consideration. It will be more fully considered in other chapters. War is defensible only as the ultimate means of establishing the cause of universal justice. Its benefits should be coextensive with its calamities. No people can be properly called a nation who are incapable of progress and self defence. A nation at peace is a nation in health. It is evidence of justice and of a wise government administered in conformity to acknowledged principles and according to knowledge. The capacity and conduct of every citizen make a part of its condition, strength and power. This principle was well understood by Washington. In a message to Congress, in 1793, he says,—

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xviii, pp. 495–6.

"There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known, that we are at all times ready for war."¹

Burke gives great importance to education as the means of preparing the people for citizenship,—but such a preparation would be lost unless accompanied by the counsel of statesmen whose knowledge of society and of the means of its advancement enable them to point out and explain the extensive relations of want, of dependence and of independence.

What Guizot says of the political conditions of social peace in France,²—is worthy of attention, as it illustrates principles. He says,—

"Whenever it shall have been distinctly perceived and fully admitted, that the different classes which exist among us, and the political parties which correspond to those classes are natural and deeply rooted elements of French society, a great step will have been made toward social peace.

"This peace is impossible so long as each of the different classes and the great political parties into which our society is divided cherishes the hope of annihilating the others, and of reigning alone. That is the evil which, ever since 1789, has periodically agitated and convulsed France. Sometimes the democratic element has aimed at the extinction of the aristocratic; at other times the aristocratic element has tried to crush the democratic, and to gain its former predominance. Constitutions, laws, and the administration of the government have been by turns directed, like engines of war, to one or the other of these ends—a war to the death, in which neither combatant believed his life compatible with that of his rival.

"This war was suspended by the Emperor Napoleon. He rallied around him the classes which had formerly possessed, and those which actually enjoyed, power and influence; and by the security which he offered them, by the continual turmoil in which he kept them, or by the yoke which he imposed upon them, he established and maintained peace.

"After him, from 1814 to 1830, and from 1830 to 1848, this war was renewed. Both the ancient aristocratic and the modern democratic elements acquired strength; but though neither could succeed in suppressing the other, each was impatient of its adversary's existence, and eagerly strove for the mastery.

"And now a third combatant has entered the arena. The democratic party having divided itself into two conflicting sections, the workmen are now arrayed (1849) against their masters, or the people against the middle classes.³ This new war, like the former, is a war to the death; for the

¹ *Sparks' Washington*, Vol. XII. p. 38.

² In the preface of his "*Democracy in*

³ Guizot's "*Democracy in France*," p. 43. *France*," Guizot says,—"The more I reflect

new aspirant is as arrogant and exclusive as the others can have ever been. The sovereignty, it is said, belongs of right to the people only; and no rival, ancient or modern, noble or bourgeois, can be admitted to share it.

“Every pretension of this kind must be withdrawn, not by one only, but by all the contending parties. The great elements of society among us—the old aristocracy, the middle classes, and the people—must completely renounce the hope of excluding and annihilating each other. Let them vie with each other in influence; let each maintain its position and its rights, or even endeavor to extend and improve them, for in such efforts consists the political life of a country. But there must be an end of all radical hostility: they must resign themselves to live together, side by side, in the ranks of the government as well as in civil society. This is the first condition of social peace. How, it may be asked, can this condition be satisfied? How can the different elements of our society be brought to tolerate each other's existence, and to fulfil their several functions in the government of the country?

“I reply, by such an organization of that government as may assign to each its place and functions; may concede something to the wishes, while it imposes limits to the ambition, of all.

“I am here met by an idea, perhaps the most false and fatal of all those current in our days on the subject of constitutional organization. It is this:—‘National unity involves political unity. There is but one people:—there can exist at the head in the name of this people, but one power.’ This is the idea which most completely characterizes both revolution and despotism. The convention and Louis XIV. exclaimed alike, ‘L’État, c’est moi.’

“It is as false as it is tyrannical. A nation is not a vast aggregate of

upon that, the more I am convinced that the evil which lies at the root of all her evils, (France) which undermines and destroys her governments and her liberties, her dignity and her happiness, is the evil which I attack;—the idolatry of Democracy.

“Whether the accession of M. Louis Napoléon Bonaparte to the Presidency of the Republic will be found an efficacious remedy for this disease, the future will show. What I have said here after the election of M. Louis Napoléon Bonaparte, I should have equally said, without the slightest alteration, if General Cavaignac had been elected. It is not to individuals, but to society itself, that great social truths are addressed.”

Without desiring to disparage the greatness of Guizot as a thinker—it is difficult to suppress astonishment that such a mind as his should fail to see the difference between feigned democracy, and the democracy of principle. Louis Napoléon was at no time a democrat. He professed democracy and republicanism with motives to popularity—but when he gained position he was false to both. He headed a republic, and created an empire. Was it “the idolatry of democracy” that enabled him to do this, or was it *treachery to democracy*? A man who chooses his politics,—discloses his real character when he possesses the power to do as he may choose.

men, consisting of so many thousands or millions, occupying a certain extent of ground, and concentrated in, and represented by, a unit, called king or assembly. A nation is a great organic body, formed by the union within one country of certain social elements which assume the shape and constitution naturally impressed upon them by the primitive laws of God and the free acts of man. The diversity of these elements is, as we have just seen one of the essential facts resulting from those laws; and is absolutely inconsistent with the false and tyrannous unity which it is proposed to establish at the centre of government, as representative of that society in which it never exists."

Because there are certain conditions to be observed and studied in the growth of nations, it is not to be inferred that the laws which govern their advancement are mutable or uncertain. Nations are not formed by chance.

NATIONS ARE NOT FORMED BY CHANCE.

A nation is no accident. The growth of a nation does not happen by chance. The character of a nation is left to no uncertainty. The continuance of a nation does not depend upon human wisdom. The age of a nation is not appointed by man. It is not within the province of man to give existence to a nation, either by edict or by legislation, or to destroy it. He is only a humble agent in the hands of his Creator to aid in the great process of its development. He can neither make nor destroy, and yet by his means failures are caused and successes demonstrated. Men, and associations of men, succeed only as they become discoverers of great truths, and faithfully apply them in practice. When a nation becomes distracted by discordant elements, from any cause, and secession is proposed as a remedy, the people have reached a period of inquiry. They pause to consider, to discuss, to learn their way.

CONVENTIONAL CONFLICT AND ACTION.

The colonists had sought the new world with the limited motives of men, and had established themselves upon the narrow basis of dependence on an outward and distant government, and upon a mere self-protection at home. They had adopted Democracy in their Institutions with but dim conceptions of its progressive power,—and they deemed the settlement of the Continent more as a private enterprise for religious security and personal comfort,—than as a public movement fraught with public interests. It was otherwise ordered. Their plans were apparently the expedients of the moment, but the principles which they adopted carried them forward beyond the wisdom of a day, and into the extended relations of humanity. They had been working for God and the world. For more than a hundred years they had

struggled against wants and dangers, and now had reached a period of maturity when great interests culminate and the relations of responsibility begin. It was a period of power when government began to realize the growing strength and importance of the Colonies. Still, it had no serious anxiety, and but few colonists ventured to hope, or predict an independence, or to counsel resistance to a government so ancient and so honored as their own. They looked upon their difficulties, with pain and anguish, but they regarded duty as a necessity, and suffering as their appointed lot. They had been taught to love the king, and to honor the Parliament,—and were slow to believe that either could be spared—and a good government established. They relied upon that paternal policy, which is suited only to a condition of weakness, and sought justice by submissive appeal and explanation,—which seldom succeeds but in the absence of interest. Their devotion to duty and perseverance against difficulty had given them character, and their industry and enterprise had opened sources of revenue to the mother country. Their prepossessions in favor of Democracy for a long time had been made sufficiently manifest to excite the jealousy of rulers, and questions of interest and of control soon indicated the necessity of concession and adjustment, or of unconditional submission. Here, then, the process of conventional separation became obviously visible to the ordinary observer.

The Government of England had really ceased to be applicable to the wants and condition of America. Its habits and policy had been circumscribed within the limits of the British Realm,¹ and if we except the spirit of colonization and commercial ambition which have given position to the nation, it may be said that England, in her progress, had faithfully preserved her ancient identity. Like men, nations have their distinctive features, and though time and change may alter, they do not destroy them. In all positions of advancement or activity—they are to be recognized in their individuality. A nation is characterized by principle, and not by territory nor by possessions, or numbers. All these are to be viewed as incidental in their relations. In other language—principles are the great

¹ In 1621, when the Commons proposed a bill to James I., for the free liberty of fishing and fishing voyages, to be made and performed on the sea-coasts and places of *Newfoundland, Virginia, and New England*, and other countries, and parts of America, the Secretary of State was sent by His Majesty with the following declaration to the House of Commons, viz: "*America is not annexed to the Realm, nor within the jurisdiction of Parliament; you have, there-*

fore, no right to interfere;" and for this reason the bill was crushed. In like manner, when a bill respecting *America* was offered by the two Houses of Parliament to King Charles I. (the very Prince who granted our charter, *Mass.*) for his Royal assent, he refused it, giving as a reason, "that the colonies were without the Realm and jurisdiction of Parliament." — *Am. Archiv. 4th Series, Vol. 2, p. 22*

levers of progress, and whether a nation be composed of ten or twenty millions of people, with a large or small territory,—to these the student is to look to find its position and power and true means of progress. All principles have each its appropriate means of accomplishing its ends, and when combined into a system of government and formally adopted by a people, it is limited by the circumstances of practicability. The government of England was a progressive monarchy,—but it was not equal to a democratic republic. The principles of the Colonists were similar, fundamentally, to those upon which the British Constitution was based, but they had been developed to meet the wants of an enlarged freedom. The Democracy of Republicanism, which alternately concentrates and diffuses the powers of government, and becomes more and more elevated on every return to the bosom of the people,—had reached the period of asserting and defending its own peculiar sphere of action in the hearts of the American people. A new centre of conventional vitality had been created, and the incipient forces of nationality soon clustered into form and energy. The spirit of loyalty in the colonists disclaimed usurpation, and the chronic spirit of conservatism in the government disclaimed tyranny.

Industry had achieved its victory over indigence, self-denial had established fixed habits of economy, and commerce had disclosed the resources of the American Continent.¹ The Colonists had succeeded in establishing a home in the wilderness, and what had been looked upon as a self exiled company of fanatics, now appeared as a prosperous and civilized community. The disgrace of struggle had given place to the elements of success, and the increase of possession invested the people with an external importance too great, and too obvious to be long exempted from foreign notice and formal recognition. America was seen to stand alone. The child had begun to step with the air of manhood, and the once humble and unnoticed Colony arose and moved with the air of nationality. What was the voice of despotism as uttered by Louis XIV., "*L'État, c'est moi*," now became the

¹ "Industry," says Botta, "a spirit of enterprise, and an extreme love of gain, are characteristic qualities of those who are separated from other men, and can expect no support but from themselves; and the colonists being descended from a nation distinguished for its boldness and activity in the prosecution of traffic, it is easily conceived that the increase of commerce was in proportion to that of population. Positive facts confirm this assertion. In 1704, the sum total of the commercial exports of Great Britain, inclusive of the merchandise des-

tined for her colonies, had been six millions five hundred and nine thousand pounds sterling; but from this year to 1772, these colonies had so increased in population and prosperity, that at this epoch they of themselves imported from England to the value of £6,22,182.00; that is to say, that in the year 1772, the colonies alone furnished the mother country with a market for a quantity of merchandise almost equal to that which, sixty-eight years before, sufficed for her commerce with all parts of the world." *Am. Rev.*, Vol. I, p. 20.

language of the people. "WE ARE THE STATE." What might be tyranny in a king was seen to be Democracy in a people.

The strength and immunities of nationality are ever to be found in sympathy with corresponding responsibilities. A government of protection in the period of weakness may soon become a government of claim and control in the period of strength. It is a fundamental law, that strength and capacity are placed in corresponding relations of duty and responsibility,—and the periods of youth and manhood—are not more distinctly marked by the laws and customs of society, than those of the colony and of the nation. The process of transition is slow and natural, and the questions which result in conflict and revolution,—arise in the ordinary prosecution of a governmental policy, whether that policy be in harmony with, or in violation of—a constitutional standard. The accumulated wants of England produced a necessity for revenue beyond the legitimate means of the government to supply, and the wisdom of the cabinet degenerated into the expedients of the financier. The politician became the arbiter of justice, Parliament the tool of party, and the King of tyranny. In fact, it was in spirit a continuation of the odious policy of the act of 1732 to keep the colonies "properly dependent upon the parent country."¹ On the other hand the democratic views of the colonies may be seen in the language of Samuel Adams, expressed in 1771. "We are either a State," he says, "as entirely independent of Great Britain as any other on earth which makes use of her protection, or we are her free colonies. In both these cases her conduct towards us should be identically the same."

GOVERNMENT, ITS OBJECTS AND ENDS.

That the reader may better understand the position of parties with respect to the great questions of controversy between the government and the people, or rather—between the Tory and the Whig parties at this time,—it will be profitable first to consider, *What Government is, its objects and ends*, as recognized and acknowledged in the Constitution of England.² This will

¹ John Nicholls, of a Tory family, and a Member of Parliament 1780 and for several years,—has the candor to speak the truth of his own country. He says,—“Has it not been acknowledged publicly, that a Bengal writership was given by the Minister to one of his friends that he might sell it, and with the produce purchase a seat in the House of Commons? The French call

us, ‘une nation pirate et bouffissée;’ and has not Indian patronage peculiarly contributed to give us that venal money-loving character, which the French attribute to us?”—*Recollections &c.*, Vol. I, p. 246.

² “It is the glory of the British Constitution that it hath its foundation in the law of God and nature.” This was the language of Samuel Adams in 1768.

serve as a standard to enable him to judge of the consistency of the Tory administration of the government, and of the patriotism of the Democratic Party which organized with an uncompromising spirit against its rule and measures. But, *What is government?* What judgment is to the mind, and self control to the individual,—government is to society. Its objects and ends are—protection, equal rights, justice and happiness.¹

It is the remark of a distinguished writer, that “society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness *positively* by uniting our affections, the latter *negatively* by restraining our vices. The one encourages intercourse, the other creates distinctions. The first is a patron, the last is a punisher.” There is truth in these views but it is not made obvious. When all admit that there is no power but of God, it becomes necessary that we should understand the nature of things as they exist in society so that the agency of this power may be seen in its exercise and development. To say that “society is produced by our wants” is to reverse the order of cause and effect, and to suppose that wants may exist independent of condition; and to say that “government is produced by our wickedness”—is to mistake the perversities of human nature for the ordinances of God. The perfection of government can be found only where there is no wickedness. There can be no wickedness in the government of God,—and if we are able to comprehend, however imperfectly, the faintest outlines of Divine Government, we may understand in some degree, the philosophy of the best human government.² When we speak of human government, we speak of government as administered by man, embracing man himself, and yet in no sense as independent of Providence. If it may be said that Divine Government is in accordance with the Will of God, it may be seen how human government may be said to be in harmony with the will of man. But let us ask what we are to understand by the *will of man*. This is to be found in his nature, and in his history.

¹ “We live under a government of three branches,” says Samuel Adams, “Wisdom, Goodness, and Power to execute *their* resolutions.” These are the sources of good government.

² To some extent and under certain circumstances it may be said that government is founded in opinion and confidence. For example, in 1792, when Jefferson wished to retire from Washington’s cabinet, he said,—“I explained to him (Washington) the circumstances of the war which first called me into public life, and those following the war, which had called me from a retirement

on which I had determined. That I had constantly kept my eye on my own home, and could no longer refrain from returning to it. As to himself, his presence was important; that he was the only man in the United States who possessed the confidence of the whole; *that government was founded in opinion and confidence*, and that the longer he remained, the stronger would become the habits of the people in submitting to the government, and in thinking it a thing to be maintained.”—*Jefferson’s Works*, Vol. ix, p. 121. But this was prejudice, not principle.

In the early ages, government was professedly and practically paternal in its nature, and in all ages of the world, where absolutism prevails—this particular feature is claimed. It was an instructive remark of Sir Walter Raleigh, that “A man must govern *himself* ere he be fit to govern a family, and his family, ere he be fit to bear the government of the Commonwealth.”¹ Dr. Whichcote thought he was making a good point when he said,—“The government of man should be the monarchy of reason; it is too often the democracy of passions, or the anarchy of humors.” This is not good philosophy. It is practically dividing the mind against itself, between two classes of powers,—denying to each what is necessary to both. Monarchy² is not especially entitled to distinction as connected with reason more than Democracy, and it may be said that both alike are subjected to the rule of the passions and to “the anarchy of humors.” If he had commended the rule of reason, and the subserviency of the passions, without reference to any form of government,—there would have been some meaning to the sentence. A government without passions would be a government without force, and a government without reason would be a government without system, a contradiction in philosophy; and to talk about “the anarchy of humors”—would mean as much as the anarchy of whims. Government, as recognized by Democracy, pre-supposes manliness, knowledge, wisdom,—and the paternal relations of advice and control are not admitted. Guardianship is not consistent with individual independence.³ When intelligence rules—a patronizing spirit becomes offensive, and ignorance disgusting. A fanatic may be the leader of the dominant party, and for a season he may be sustained by the excessive zeal of others whose chief merit is to assent and follow,—but his leadership ceases the moment

¹ “Man, till capable,” says Judge Woodbury, “by years of discretion and knowledge, to judge for himself in matters of government, may well acquiesce in what he finds established.”—*Works*, VOL. III, p. 189.

² “No race of Kings,” says Jefferson, “has ever presented above one man of common sense in twenty generations. The best they can do is, to leave things to their ministers; and what are their ministers, but a committee, badly chosen? If the king ever meddles it is to do harm.”—*Works*, VOL. II, p. 221.

³ Baron Humboldt says,—“In every attempt to frame or reorganize a political Constitution, there are two grand objects, it seems to me, to be distinctly kept in view, neither of which can be overlooked or

made subordinate without serious injury to the common design; these are—first, to determine, as regards the nation in question, who shall govern, who shall be governed, and to arrange the actual working of the constitutional power; and secondly, to prescribe the exact sphere to which the government, once constructed, should extend or confine its operations. The latter object, which more immediately embraces the private life of the citizen, and more especially determines the limits of his free, spontaneous activity, is strictly speaking, the true ultimate purpose; the former is only a necessary means for arriving at this important end.”—*Sphere and Duties of Government*, p. 2.

his party is made to suffer and is moved by the comprehensive spirit of intelligence. If men are not conscious of a superior power in themselves, to govern, others are able to see it in them, and to appreciate it. Its existence is self asserted, and society acknowledges its rule.

Jefferson says,—“The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest.” This is true so far as the administration of a government is concerned,—but an honest official is not always a capable statesman, and we often find capacity without integrity. An honest man will not undertake to do what he does not understand.¹ A more comprehensive view is taken by M. Guizot, who says,—“By the side of those relations which create and regulate the will of those who are engaged in them, there is placed another social element, the government, which also creates and maintains relations between men independently of their will. When I say *government*, I comprehend under that word the powers of every kind which exist in society, from domestic powers which extend not beyond the family, up to the public powers which are placed at the head of the state. The entirety of these powers is accordingly a mighty social bond; they not only give birth to many relations between men which their will alone could not create, but they impose upon those relations, and upon many others, perpetuity and regularity, the pledge of the peace and progressive development of society. Individual wills and public powers, the free choice of men and the government, these are the two sources whence are derived human relations, and their transformation into active and permanent society.”²

This philosophical recital of facts is too general to give a clear idea of the principles of government by accepting the general proposition that all governments are founded on compromise. This is simply the process of adjustment, and it illustrates the progress of principle, but it does not explain it. It was remarked by Burke, in the British Parliament, that “All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences; we give and take; we remit some rights that we may enjoy others; and, we choose rather to be happy citizens, than subtle dis-

¹“Ask the first ten men you meet,” says Mr. Butts, of New York, “if they respectively can manage a cotton factory, or a printing office, or an iron foundry, or even a steam engine, and it is probable that every one will answer ‘No.’ ‘Why can’t you, as I want a man to manage my factory?’ ‘Why can’t I?’ the questioned would respond in amazement. ‘Why can’t I manage your factory?’ Simply because I don’t know the first thing

about that sort of machinery.’ Now address the same ten men on the subject of politics; tell them you have a city to ‘run;’ and ask each one if he is competent to take the ‘management’ and see that none of the interests committed to his charge shall suffer; probably every man would answer ‘Yes,’ without a show of doubt.”

² Hist. Civ., Vol. III, p. 194.

putants. As we must give away some natural liberty, to enjoy civil advantages; so we must sacrifice some civil liberties, for the advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire. But in all fair dealings the thing bought must bear some proportion to the purchase paid. None will barter away the immediate jewel of his soul."¹ Here, again, we see the process of adjustment, but when the principle itself is reached, the integrity of the soul, no further compromise is deemed possible. It may often be attempted, but ultimate failure is inevitable. An important distinction is here to be made, between conceit of self importance and the obvious teachings of history. A man may be sincere and honest, and yet ignorant and bent upon error. Not designedly, because design implies judgment, and judgment knowledge and the right use of it. When a blind man can teach the philosophy of colors, an ignorant man can give a wise answer without knowledge. Conscience helps him according to the degree of its inherent strength, and as Shakespeare truly says,—it "hath a thousand several tongues," but its speech is only upon the doings of the mind, whether much or little, whether strong or feeble. It acts on knowledge, it does not supply it. It feels, it does not think. In the absence of truth it is faithful to error. The true conscience deeply scrutinizes itself, and employs an enlightened judgment to guard against the mistakes of ignorance, the impositions of the sinful, and the assumptions of will.

Government is coeval with society. It is a necessity resulting from the nature and constitution of things. As a system, it is based upon knowledge, and as a power upon wisdom. It is successful when in harmony with the genius and condition of the people for whom it is designed,—and for the very obvious reason that it is adapted to their wants and powers of appreciation. It fails, whenever it is made the instrument of injustice to the many to gratify the few, or whenever it ceases as a system to accomplish for all what may be denominated the best good of any. It is not a creation by chance, or accident,—nor an impracticable theory that demands a good beyond the means which are possessed for accomplishing it. A thousand theories of government may be framed, and with high and pure motives of justice and philanthropy,—but they are powerless and useless unless adapted to the capacities, circumstances and means of those they are designed to aid or control. If they demand too much,—they are defeated by ignorance, for the reason that their provisions are those of knowledge, which require knowledge for their execution. If they ask too little,—the knowledge of the few becomes selfish,—and the moral standard of the many is left exposed to outrage and is deprived of its legitimate sympathies. Hence, it may be inferred that a government permitted is practically

¹Parl. Deb., Vol. xviii, p. 527.

a government by consent. Not personal or theoretical consent, but that consent acquired by usage, which is graduated to a high or a low standard accorded to those elements of power to be found in capacity and condition which vary as the mind is influenced or improved. Every step in progress adds a new power to society,—indeed, progress is but another word signifying the march of power in its varied forms of development and application. The doctrine of *might*, is merely the plain doctrine of power, which implies not only control on the part of the government, but consent on the part of the governed. A demand for practical freedom, could not be expressed without an explicit knowledge of its conditions and privileges; and, without a clear discernment of these an intelligent sovereign would be slow to lessen or to surrender his prerogatives. Submission to tyranny implies ignorance of freedom, because the knowledge incident to liberty is ever self protective. “Freedom,” says Baron Humboldt, “is but the *possibility* of a various and indefinite activity; while government, or the exercise of dominion, is a single, but yet *real* activity.”¹ Truth and justice are conditions of power, when recognized by an intelligent people, but tyranny is a condition of weakness, if the people passively submit to its impositions. A government is characterized by the people, and the people are made subject to laws in harmony with their virtues and knowledge. A government is weak or strong, good or bad, according to the degree of knowledge with which it is administered,—and its most perfect form of success is to be found in democracy,—where the general welfare, and the consent of the people are made the basis of legislation. As true government is inherent in the constitution of things and has a common object, it follows that it must have a common origin, and that is to be found in the will of the people. This is denominated **SELF GOVERNMENT**, which is practicable where a people are sufficiently intelligent to know their own wants, as well as the wants of others—and the best means of providing for them. A common standard is erected upon a constitution, and by this all legislation is to be weighed and measured.² In the constitution the ends and means are declared, and by general consent these alone are deemed legitimate,—whether proposed by a King or a subject, by a republican President, or a citizen.

It was a remark of FÉNELON, that the King of Great Britain had “an unlimited power to do good, and was only restrained from doing evil.”

¹ Sphere of Government, p. 8.

inconveniences, and not accomplishing fully its object. But the good in this instance, vastly overweighs the evil.”—VOL. III, p. 8.

² Jefferson favored a Declaration of Rights —by way of supplement to a Constitution.

In a letter to James Madison, 1789, he says —“The declaration of rights is, like all other human blessings, alloyed with some

A declaration of rights strictly adapted to a constitution would be an interpretation of its principles, and would afford important aid during all time in its construction.

This limitation reduces a monarch to a common level, and the remark is not alone applicable to England. It is even true of men. All nations do not have written constitutions, nor confirmed methods of testing the acts of government,—but there is no nation, that does not recognize a principle, or power, above government, either conventional, traditional, or divine. Christian despots kiss the Cross, and Pagan Rulers bow to their Idols, or to their Prophets.

“The English Government,” wrote Montesquieu in 1748, “has nothing to support it but a delusive outside, extremely flattering to the people, who fancy themselves the sole governors. I do not know any country where it is more easy to create such open dissensions, as may overthrow the state. A man of sense and generosity may, in ten years time, erect himself into a despotic Prince with more safety at London than at Moscow; remember Cromwell.¹ Money alone is sufficient to corrupt the whole Parliament.”² If Fénelon gave a theory above practice, it must be admitted that Montesquieu recited abuses exaggerated beyond fact. Fénelon feared an unprincipled King, and Montesquieu a corrupt Parliament. That the Government of England had long been regarded as a government eminently responsible to the people, was admitted by all.

To use the language employed in Massachusetts, in 1780, “Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men.”

In this brief sentence the blessings and abuses of government are clearly indicated, and if the reader will carefully note the language he cannot fail to have accurate views of measures tested by so plain a standard.

There is a common remark that “*the world is governed too much*,”—but

¹ Cromwell wanted only a government of the saints. “He spent eight days,” says Dr. Lingard, (1653) in close consultation with his military divan; and the result was a determination to call a new parliament modelled on principles unknown to the history of this or any other nation. It was to be a parliament of saints, of men who had not offered themselves as candidates, or had been chosen by the people, but whose chief qualification consisted in holiness of life, and whose call to the office of legislators came from the choice of the council.”—*Dr. Lingard's Hist. Eng.*, Vol. VIII, p. 197.

He attempted to organize such a parliament, and was aided by “godly persons and

the Congregational Churches.” As he did not succeed it is evident that in this case “the Spirit of God spoke (*not*) in him and by him.”

² “Montesquieu had sounded the institutions,” says Lamartine, “and analyzed the laws of all people. By classing governments, he had compared them, by comparing, he passed judgment on them; and this judgment brought out, in its bold relief, and contrast, on every page, right and force, privilege and equality, tyranny and liberty.” And yet, in giving his opinion of the government of England he omitted the most important element of his subject—the laws of national growth.

this is claiming success for failure. True government is a blessing always,—and it is an abuse of language to call the experiments of legislation government. When legislative experiments fail,—the world is governed too little,—as evils are often permitted by a want of the knowledge of the right means to prevent them.¹ Legislation is not government, and government must not be mistaken for authority. Government is the consistent and successful action of society in the transaction of its own legitimate business by its own lawful agents. Authority implies the right to employ force, but not the ability to command unity. Principles in themselves are laws, and just government is their result. Just government wisely provides for its own continuance and is successful; an arbitrary or oppressive government fails to become strong and enduring because its helps are forced or fictitious.

It is well understood that if business men conform to certain rules, they succeed; otherwise, they fail. This truth is applicable to government. A government of eternal truth and justice—is self protective. It stands forever. If a government be based upon coercion, it cannot stand. It is against nature.² It is self destructive. Mere force—is brute force. It is the control of power without reference to its moral application. It is supremely selfish. It knows no means of life except by means of death. It has no philosophy, it knows none, it wants none. It is well characterized by Milton,—

“So spake the fiend, and with necessity,
The tyrant's plea, excus'd his devilish deeds.”

Attempts have been made, in all ages, to explain and justify it,—but by

“The brute philosopher, who ne'er has proved
The joy of loving or of being loved.”

¹The celebrated Count Oxenstiern, chancellor of Sweden, one day when his son was expressing to him his diffidence of his own abilities, and the dread which he thought of ever engaging in the management of public affairs, made the following Latin answer to him: *Nescis, mi fili, quam parvâ cum sapientiâ regitur mundus.* You do not know, my son, with what little wisdom the world is governed.”—*De Lolme Brit. Const.* p. 1024. The modesty of the son was more commendable than the judgment of the father. Without wisdom there can be no government. With “little wisdom the world is” not “governed.”

²Force is abhorrent to nature, whether as an aid, or detriment. Over-feeding pro-

duces deformity and premature death in animals, and when fruit trees are too much fertilized they are barren. The difference in the results of freedom, when compared to those of coercion, is beautifully stated by Baron Humboldt: “Freedom exalts power; and, as is always the collateral effect of increasing strength, tends to induce a spirit of liberality. Coercion stifles power, and engenders all selfish desires, and all the mean artifices of weakness. Coercion may prevent transgressions; but it robs even actions which are legal of a portion of their beauty. Freedom may lead to many transgressions, but it lends even to vices a less ignoble form.”—*Sphere of Government*, p. 111.

Military power, of itself, is the power of the brigand. It is no less, no more. Its continuance depends upon management. By an accidental, or cunningly designed mixture of right with wrong, it occasionally succeeds; but much good luck leads to recklessness, and the chance of success is ultimately lost. Military power, in no sense, is government, although government may employ it. It is always to be the servant, but never the master. It is ordained to prevent war, not to make it; to secure peace, not to destroy it. Joubart says,—“Force and right rule all things in the world; force, before right arrives.” If government be based upon a Church establishment, it cannot stand. The Church is of indispensable importance: its aids to weakness, its relief to ignorance, wickedness and misery cannot be measured, but its mission is special and limited. A limited agency cannot supply universal need.¹ A government based on commerce, or industrial pursuits, cannot stand. Trade centres in self—its object is gain. To favor special interests would be to ignore general good. Special legislation generally comes from excessive zeal,

¹ The church is variable and divided. The clergy occupy no permanent position of influence, they are uncertain. Neal gives the following specimen of the arbitrary manner in which the ministers were treated in England. It is an account of the examination of the London clergy: “When the ministers appeared in court, Mr. Thomas Cole, a clergyman, being placed by the side of the Commissioners, in priestly apparel, the Bishop’s chancellor from the bench addressed them in these words: ‘My masters, and ye ministers in London, the Council’s pleasure is, that ye strictly keep the unity of apparel, like the man who stands here canonically habited with a square cap, a scholar’s gown priest-like, a tippet, and in the church a linen surplice. Ye that will subscribe, write *volo*; those that will not subscribe, write *nolo*. Be brief, make no words.’ Those that refused were suspended from office. In 1585 and 1586, there were only two thousand ministers to serve ten thousand churches. Bishop Sandys, in one of his sermons before Queen Elizabeth, told her Majesty, that some of her subjects did not hear one sermon in seven years, and that their blood would be required of some one. Her Majesty thought three or four preachers in a county sufficient.”—*Neal*, VOL. I, pp. 236, 359.

In 1688-9, when the throne was declared vacant, in Parliament, Pollexfen said: “Some of the clergy for one thing, some for another; I think they scarce know what they would have.”—*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. V, p. 55. Maynard, an influential member, said: “I think the clergy are out of their wits; and I believe, if the clergy should have their wills, few or none of us should be here again.” The indignation at this time against the clergy was great, caused by their obvious desire to sacrifice the country to the interests of the church.—*See Buckle*, VOL. I, p. 294.

Lord Brougham says,—“High Churchman” and “High Monarchy Man” became synonymous terms. “Tory” implied both the one and the other; and the watchword of the party was “Church and King!”—a cry of a political nature, and not of a religious. The Whigs held an opposite course. They regarded the people as the real source of power.”—*Polit. Philos.*, VOL. I, p. 61. The alliance of church and state was well understood by Dr. Paley. He says,—“The single view under which we ought to consider a church establishment is that of a scheme of instruction—the single end we ought to propose by it is the preservation and confirmation of religious knowledge. Every other idea and every other end that has

or limited views. Exclusive reforms are apt to create new evils by unwise attempts to remove old ones. John Adams says,—“Harrington has shown that power always follows property. This I believe to be as infallible a maxim in politics, as that action and reaction are equal, in mechanics. Nay, I believe we may advance one step further, and affirm that the balance of power in a society accompanies the balance of property in land.” That such is the tendency, cannot be denied, but the tendencies of things do not establish the standard either of good, or evil. The tendencies of things are like the drift wood upon the bosom of the tide, or river,—it floats with the prevailing current. It is the wisdom, or skill of life, to use these tendencies as the mariner uses the wind, to sail when it is right, and to anchor when it is wrong. It is true, a side breeze is made available, and when this is denied, resort is made to the oar, or to steam. But, in pursuing this inquiry it is safe to follow the counsel of President Adams, to look to nature. “The first maxim of a statesman,” says he, “as well as that of a statuary or a painter, should be to study nature.” Let us turn for a moment to history and science and see what nature teaches. What are her lessons on government, so far as we are able to discover them in man, and in nature. In history, all governments are denominated good, or bad, according to their fruits as acknowledged and enjoyed by the people who have been the subjects of them. As it is expressed by Solomon,—“When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.” “Inquire no longer, man!” exclaimed Rousseau, “who is the author of evil; behold him in yourself.—Take away every thing that is the work of man, and all the rest is good.” In Bible history we read of the good reigns of Jehosophat, of Jotham, of Josiah, and of Hezekiah; and of the wicked reigns of Jehoram, of Ahaziah, of Ahaz, and of Manasseh. In all nations, both ancient and modern, the record of man is the same, summed up in two words, good and evil. In the pursuit of good, all have the same motives, for no one can enjoy evil—all desire to be happy. Good produces benefit and happiness, evil produces loss and misery. These maxims are as true of governments as of individuals. We have seen that the rule of Providence, *Vox populi est vox Dei*, is virtually acknowledged by all men, by all nations, both Pagan and Christian, but these are simply the facts of history. We desire to understand them—so that we may know the standard of principle by which all governments are decided to be good or bad.

The Christian rule of conduct among men, as given by St. Paul, is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” Though nothing could be plainer, still, an explanation is added: “Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” The principle is stated and explained, and the theory is as applicable to the general duties of the government as to the social or domestic duties of

society.¹ Nations, as well as men, profess more than they practice, and it is a redeeming merit in man, that his prayers are ever in advance of his conduct. This rule of duty has for its basis the Attributes of Deity, but the illimitable extent of these cannot be comprehended by man,—though it is the constant struggle of an aspiring soul always to lessen its selfish aims and instincts, and to seek universal good. The standard is Infinite, but man is finite, and hence the struggle will be forever :

“ Because in the great future buried deep,
Beyond our plans of empire and renown,
Lies all that man with ardour should pursue,
And he who made him, bent him to the right.”

This is sound philosophy. It is the philosophy of the maxim just quoted,—“ *Vox populi est vox Dei.*”

This subject was beautifully presented by Solomon. His first view was of parental government :

“ My son, keep thy father’s commandment, and forsake not the law of thy mother : Bind them continually upon thy heart, and tie them about thy neck. When thou goest, it shall lead thee ; when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee ; and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee.”

This is the government of the affections, where parental authority is exercised in harmony with the high requisitions of duty.² The governments

been mixed with this—as the making of the church and engine, or even an ally of the state ; converting it into the means of strengthening or of diffusing influence ; or of regarding it as a support of regal, in opposition to popular, forms of government—has served only to debase the institution, and to introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses.”

¹ “ To do good to others ;” says Buckle, “ to sacrifice for their benefit your own wishes ; to love your neighbor as yourself ; to forgive your enemies ; to restrain your passions ; to honor your parents ; to respect those who are set over you : these, and a few others, are the sole essentials of morals ; but they have been known for thousands of years.”—VOL. I, p. 129.

² “ The universally pervading and governing principle of the Chinese Empire,” says Lord Brougham, “ is the Parental Authority. The father of a family has all but absolute power over its whole members.

Even if he puts a child to death he is only punishable as for a minor offence ; but any outrage, even of a slight nature, upon his person, is punishable with death in the child. Such offences are, however, almost wholly unknown in a country where the utmost pains are taken to inculcate reverence for parents, from the earliest infancy of the child, as the most obligatory of all duties, and to make it a part of each person’s nature. Some years ago a man joined with his wife in beating his mother : both were executed ; the wife’s mother was whipped, though wholly innocent ; the house in which they lived was razed to the ground ; the district was solemnly cursed ; all the students belonging to it were degraded ; and the magistrates were removed from their offices and banished from the place. The object of the law is to impress the mind with a feeling of the awful nature of this obligation.—*Polit. Philos.* VOL. I, p. 165.

of nations, according to Solomon—should be based upon wisdom. Not the wisdom of man, but of the Lord,—a wisdom that is “better than rubies; and all things that may be desired are not to be compared to it.” But wisdom is defined by herself: “I Wisdom dwell with Prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions. Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom: I am understanding; I have strength. By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth. Riches and honor are with me; yea, durable riches and righteousness. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was.” This is the wisdom of Providence.

“The wisdom of the Deity,” says Paley, “as testified in the works of creation, surpasses all idea we have of wisdom drawn from the highest intellectual operations of the highest class of intelligent beings with whom we are acquainted.”¹ On this wisdom is based the government of the universe, and although it is beyond human capacity to fathom its depths and mysteries,—all are more or less able to see its illimitable beneficence.

“Through worlds unnumbered though the God be known,
'Tis ours to trace him only in our own.”

“Our human laws,” says Froude, “are but the copies, more or less imperfect, of the eternal laws so far as we can read them, and either succeed and promote our welfare, or fail and bring confusion and disaster, according as the legislator’s insight has detected the true principle, or has been distorted by ignorance or selfishness.”

Turning from the Divine to human wisdom, and from the Divine to human government,—we are yet to observe the perfection of those laws, and the administration of them,—which regulate growth and which constitute the government of the entire external world. All things are created and placed in productive order, together, each part controlling and controlled, and all united under general laws, to agree or disagree, to accomplish a purpose or to serve an end.² The elements, all forms of matter—

¹ It was a saying in China, B. C. 2200: “It is only virtue that moves Heaven, there is no distance to which it does not extend; fulness invites diminution, while humility receives additions; this is Heaven’s way.”—*Shoo-King*, Book I, p. 56.

in order that the whole and each constituent have free movement and scope for productive exertion and full enjoyment of life. As the skull from the brain, of which it is the shield, this *outward* should draw its shape and character from the *inward*.

² “Simply protective,” says Geo. H. Calvert, “ought to be the outward mechanism we call government, the genuine office of which is, to be a defensive rampart round a community and round each member thereof;

“For reconstruction, outward mechanism is powerless; for that, we must, through the unfolding of all the individualities of civilized men, give full play to inward movement, to which play good government

are governed by unalterable laws,—which it is the business of the philosopher to unfold, and the practical man, or mechanic to apply. The fruits and flowers of the earth, are produced with a uniformity that indicates the government of nature,—and their failure is always to be traced either to the ignorance of man, which can be avoided, or to the unpropitious season, which cannot be foreseen. The arts are advanced by the faithful student just in that degree in which he comprehends the laws of nature,—or the government of things,—whether the problem be of form in marble, in expression upon the canvas, or in the harmony of sounds.

Instinct—throughout the animated world has ever been invariable. Its government remains unchanged. It is a power made ready for specific action by the hand of Deity,—and requires no training for its purposes. It attempts no experiment, it commits no error. It is perfect, and cannot be improved by the feeble agency of man. The Bee forms its cell with no greater accuracy, with no better finish now than when Virgil wrote. The Beasts and Birds, the Fishes and Insects of the world are no better protected by the precautions of nature in the days of Cuvier and Audubon, than they were when Confucius¹ taught, or when great Cæsar ruled.

With an imperfect idea of government where there can be no error, let us turn to the consideration of human government, the success of which depends upon human wisdom. But what is human wisdom? Temple says —“Wisdom is that which makes men judge what are the best ends, and what the best means to attain them.” Fleming says,—“Wisdom is the right use or exercise of knowledge, and differs from knowledge as the use which is made of a power or faculty differs from the power or faculty itself.” These definitions both imply the necessity of knowledge as a prerequisite to wisdom. And “The word knowledge,” says Bishop Whateley, “strictly employed implies three things, viz. truth, proof and conviction.” But the right use of knowledge, or wisdom, implies the convictions of duty, as well as of mind. Here, then, we have the elements of wisdom which alone can form the basis of an organized government, a system of public duty, accompanied with a declaration of rights, of principle, and rules of practice. A system of public means to establish equity, to execute justice,

is conducive. When the man-contrived machinery is, or gets to be, discordant with the God-implanted internal forces, then government becomes oppressive and tyrannical, and is obstructive rather than protective.” —*Social Science*, p. 110.

¹ “After rejecting all the fabulous traditions,” says Lord Brougham, “there is good reason for allowing the annals of the Empire (Chinese) to reach as far back as eleven

centuries before our era. The writings of Confucius, (from a Latin version of his name—but in his own language Koong—foo-tse) contemporary with Herodotus, and who flourished between five and six hundred years B. C., record events five hundred years earlier.” Confucius was a great philosopher and lawgiver—to whom the Chinese State pay divine honors.—*Polit. Phil.* Vol. 1, p. 163. Truths from all sources were centred in him.

to secure equal rights among men, to encourage industry and to promote happiness. The elements of this system are sometimes seen in individual character, in persons who appear to have an intuitive sense of truth and right, and of the right way of doing things. They are naturally leaders. This is seen among children. To this source, in some degree, George Combe traces the origin of government. In explanation of his views, he says,—“A good illustration of this occurs in the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin. The force of character arising from his large brain, and his fertility in expedients, made him a ruler in childhood as well as in mature age. “Residing near the water,” says he, “I was much in it and on it. I learned to swim well, and to manage boats; and when embarked with other boys, I was commonly allowed to govern, especially in any case of difficulty; and upon other occasions I was generally the leader of the boys.”¹

Government is an institution framed by wisdom and adopted by consent. It is impersonal, made so by mutual concession. It is the personification of citizenship. It is not the will of one man, nor the will of many, but the will of all by conventional agreement. It is a delegated authority, to be executed by chosen agents, and alike for all. Nothing is to be done by chance, or discretion, but by prescribed rules. All questions of interpretation, of precedent, of usage, of tradition, and of change,—are to be decided by established rules. The judiciary is the appointed interpreter.

There can be no government where ignorance prevails. It must be one of knowledge—that principles may be understood; it must be one of truth, that justice may be executed; it must be one of wisdom, that legitimate means may be proportioned to legitimate ends; it must be one of integrity, that the high requisitions of constitutional duty may be promptly met, and never evaded; it must be one of honor, that character may be held sacred; it must be one of equity, that freedom may be possible; it must be one of character, that confidence may be commanded; it must be one of religion, that man may be taught meekly to bow to the will of God;² it must be administered by statesmen of capacity and experience,—so that wisdom may be distinguished from folly, truth from error, right from wrong, freedom from tyranny, party from patriotism, and government from despotism. Despotism is not government; party is not government; priestcraft is not government; the Church is not government; the magistrates—elected to adminis-

¹ Combe's Moral Philosophy, p. 387.

² Chow-kung, an Emperor of China, who ruled B. C. 1108, expressed his opinion on this subject in the beautiful language of sentiment: “That perfect government is

fragrant, and influences the immortal gods; meat offerings have no sweet savour, but resplendent virtue is odoriferous.”—*Shoo-king*, Book vi, p. 298.

ter government, are not government; but government is an institution which all help to make, and which all consent to obey, when lawfully administered, and which all agree to defend with honor, life and property against the dangers of treason, or the perversions of party. Here, then, we cannot but see the sources of intelligent legislation. But, let us ask what is the difference between government and the administration of government.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GOVERNMENT, AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT.

It is an axiomatic truth that there must be an organized government before it can be administered. The organization must be systematic, and practically efficient.¹ The parts must be consistent one with another, and

¹ It is interesting to see how ingeniously an honest Tory justifies a tory administration of a democratic government. Principles are acknowledged but they are perverted by application. Guizot says, "It is absurd to seek the principle of the political stability of government in the mobile elements of society. The permanent elements of society must find in the government itself, powers corresponding to them, and offering a pledge for their security. A diversity of powers is equally indispensable to conservation and to liberty. It is a matter of amazement that this truth should be disputed, for the very men who dispute it have made a great step toward its admission and application. After establishing unity of power at the head of the state, they have admitted a division of powers lower down, on account of the diversity of functions. They have carefully separated the legislative, executive, administrative, and judicial powers; thus practically acknowledging the necessity of giving guarantees to different interests, by the separation and the different constitution of these powers. How is it that they do not see that this necessity has a higher application, and that the diversity of the general interests of society and of the duties of the supreme power, imperatively requires a diversity of powers in the highest as well as in the subordinate spheres of government?"

"But to constitute a real and efficient diversity of powers, it is not enough that each should have a distinct place and name in the government; it is also necessary that all should be strongly organized, all fully competent to fill and to maintain the place they occupy."

"It is the fashion of the day to think that harmony among the powers of the state, and security against their excess, is to be found in their weakness. People are afraid of every kind of authority; and in order to prevent their destroying each other, or encroaching upon liberty, they ingeniously endeavor to undermine them all in turn."

"This is a monstrous error. Every weak power is a power doomed to perish by extinction or by usurpation. If several weak powers conflict, either one will become strong at the expense of the others, and will end in a tyranny, or they will trammel and neutralize each other, and the result will be anarchy."—*Democracy in France*, p. 46.

A Tory seems to be incapable of understanding how a "unity of power," and a "diversity of functions," can be explained unless the whole be submerged in the bottomless abyss of undefined and irresponsible authority. *People are not afraid of authority legally exercised.* They have much reason to fear usurped authority. All powers have

the whole in harmony with the known views and wishes of the people who are to be the subjects of it. It must be adapted to their condition and wants. Otherwise it would be a mere jumble of precepts, a mockery of purpose, not a government. What a machine is, in Mechanics, a government is in philosophy. The machine is one thing, to work it is quite another. A machine may be complete and in perfect order,—but an ignorant bungler is more likely to break it than work it well. So of a government. It may be all that the people want in form, in design, in character, but magistrates ignorant of the principles of government, or moved by dishonest motives to violate them for selfish purposes—would be utterly powerless for good. They could not administer it.

The difference between a government and the administration of a government is fundamental. The one is an established institution, the other practically comprises its objects and uses. The one is the principle, and the other is the application of the principle. The one is the power, the other the use of the power. It may be legitimately used, or it may be subverted or abused.¹ The machinery of constitutional government is a system of directions, checks and guards,—an agency under instructions. Magistrates are only authorized agents, and when they exceed their authority they cease to be magistrates.² To turn again to nature,—the government of the farm, or the garden, is to be found in the constitution of nature, in the laws of vegetation as developed in the growth of trees, shrubs

their degrees of importance, but the most unimportant power has its distinct and independent functions, and should be held as inviolable as the most important. No power is weak that is legally exercised. All powers become as nothing when centralized. It is clearly absurd to “seek the principle of the political stability of government,” any where else *but in the mobile elements of society*. “It is a monstrous error” to assume, that any government can be strengthened by arbitrary power. Its tendency is always to *weaken*.

¹ It is well to quote a Tory in condemnation of a prevailing tory crime. Bolingbroke says,—“To govern a society of Freemen by a *Constitution*, founded on the Eternal Rules of right Reason, and directed to promote the Happiness of the whole, and of every Individual, is the noblest Prerogative, which can belong to Humanity; and if a man may be said, without profaneness, to

imitate God in any case, this is the case. But sure I am, he imitates the Devil, who is so far from promoting the happiness of others, that he makes his own happiness to consist in the Misery of others; who governs by no Rule but that of his Passions, whatever of appearances he is forced sometimes to put on; who endeavors to corrupt the innocent, and to enslave the free; whose business is to seduce or betray; whose pleasure is to damn; and whose triumph is to torment.”—*Dissertation on Parties*, p. 146.

² The relations between a chief magistrate and his counsellors are well stated by an ancient Emperor of China (B. C. 2000): “You ministers constitute my legs and arms, my ears and eyes. Should I wish to aid the people, you must assist me; should I wish to spread my power abroad, you must act for me.”—*Shoo-King*. Book 1, p. 68.

and plants, and in the soils, and it may be said that this government is administered by the farmer and gardener, and that their success is always according to knowledge. This government which is to be found in nature is always the same, and it is one of undeviating power.¹ The seed germinates, each representing its own kind, and producing its own fruits. When rightly administered,—the results are both marvellous and beautiful. Products are perfected and made certain, and industry and knowledge are amply rewarded. The agriculturist, the manufacturer, the artist, and the mechanic,—are successful or otherwise, invariably, according to their degree of knowledge of the natural laws, and their observance of them. This exact knowledge of the nature of things is much more important in the administration of government, in the moral world than in the physical. The one secures protection, without which there could be no enjoyments, the other enjoyments, which could not be realized without protection.

Guizot says,—“It is difficult to determine with any degree of precision, what we ought to understand by *administration* in the government of a state. Nevertheless, when we endeavor to investigate this fact, we discover, I believe, that, under the most general point of view, administration consists in the aggregate of means destined to propel, as promptly and certainly as possible, the will of the central power through all parts of society, and to make the force of society, whether consisting of men or money, return again, under the same conditions, to the central power. This, if I mistake not, is the true aim, the predominant characteristic of administration.”²

Again, he says,—“The government of Louis XIV. was a great fact, a fact powerful and splendid, but without roots. Free institutions are a

¹ This undeviating power in nature is well illustrated by an account of the growing power of a tree in England. “Walton Hall had at one time its own corn-mill, and when that inconvenient necessity no longer existed, the mill-stone was laid in an orchard and forgotten. The diameter of this circular stone measured 5 1-2 feet; while its depth averaged seven inches throughout; its central hole had a diameter of eleven inches. By mere accident, some bird or squirrel had dropped the fruit of the filbert tree through this hole on to the earth, and in 1812 the seedling was seen rising up through that unwonted channel. As its trunk gradually grew through this aperture and increased, its power to raise the ponderous mass of stone was speculated on by

many. Would the filbert tree die in the attempt? Would it burst the mill-stone, or would it lift it? In the end the little filbert tree lifted the mill-stone, and in 1868 wore it like crinoline about its trunk, and Mr. Waterton used to sit upon it under the branching shade.”—*English Paper*.

² To speak of “the will of the central power,” is tory language. The executive power of a constitutional government can have no will of its own except within the prescribed sphere of official duty to bring all the parts into harmony as a whole. And in doing this, it has no discretion, but to conform to principles such as have been approved and adopted at some time by the expressed will of the people.

guarantee, not only of the wisdom of governments, but of their duration. No system can endure except by means of institutions." "A fact powerful and splendid, but without roots," is an expression of great significance. It refers to an administration without authority, as a tree without roots is the semblance of a tree. A similar analogical illustration was given by Aristotle.¹ Instead, however, of free institutions being a guarantee of the wisdom and duration of governments, it may more properly be said that free institutions are the evidence of sufficient knowledge and wisdom so to administer governments as to secure their success and duration. Free institutions are results, and when found, they are always seen to be not only deeply rooted in soils made congenial, but they are vivified by an atmosphere of light and heat peculiarly their own. In speaking of the 18th century, Guizot adds a further remark, and speaks of the "almost complete disappearance of the government," and of "the human mind as the principal and almost the only actor." This was an administration without roots, or rather it was a weed with roots. In connection with this condition, he alludes to "the universality of free inquiry." In periods of free inquiry the mind goes forward in its speculative flights, and apparently without any pause to investigate principles. Government gives place to new theories and experiments, and wisdom and experience, precedent and law are counted as obstacles to progress. Change is called reform. During these periods, it is quite true, governments disappear, and in their stead we find the will of a fanatic, or a dictator, or the will of a party which is deemed paramount to government. The spirit of usurpation rules, and government disappears.

De Lolme says, that "various inaccuracies exist as to the distinction between 'constitution' and 'government.'"² Bolingbroke correctly discriminates the one from the other. By "constitution," he says, "we mean, whenever we speak with propriety and exactness, the assemblage of laws, institutions, and customs, derived from certain fixed principles of reason, directed to certain fixed objects of public good, that compose the general system, according to which the community hath agreed to be governed."³

"By 'government,' we mean, whenever we speak in the same manner, that particular tenor of conduct, which a chief magistrate, and inferior magistrates under his direction and influence, hold in the administration of public affairs."

¹ Aristotle believed "that both society and government are as congenial to the nature of man, as it is natural for a plant to fix its roots in the earth, to extend its branches, or to scatter its seeds."—*Ethics and Politics*, Vol. II, p. 2.

² *Rise and Progress of English Constitution*, Vol. I, p. 5.

³ This definition is particularly applicable to the English Constitution.

“ We call this a good government, when the execution of the laws, the observation of the institutions and customs, in short, the whole administration of public affairs, is wisely pursued, and with a strict conformity to the principles and objects of the constitution.

“ We call it a bad government, when it is administered on other principles, and directed to other objects, either wickedly or weakly, either by obtaining new laws which want this conformity, or by preventing old ones which had it; and when this is done without law, or in open violation of the laws, we term it tyrannical government. In a word, and to bring this home to our own case, constitution is the rule, by which our Princes ought to govern, at all times; government is that, by which they actually do govern, at any particular time. One remains immutable; the other may, and as human nature is constituted, must vary. One is the criterion, by which we are to try the other; for surely we have a right to do so, since if we are to live in subjection to the government of our kings, our kings are to govern in subjection to the constitution; and the conformity, or non-conformity of their government to it, prescribes the measure of our submission to them, according to the principles of the Revolution, and of our present settlement; in both of which, though some remote regard was had to Blood, the preservation of the Constitution manifestly determined the community to the choice then made of the persons, who should govern.” But what is government as defined by the British Constitution?

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

Government is either Absolute or Democratic. The one centralizes all power in the will of a sovereign; the other recognizes the will of the people as the source of all power, and subdivides and delegates such power to be exercised by agents duly appointed according to a constitution. All other forms of government, of whatever name, are adjusted upon the scale of degree—between these two. An Absolute government may become democratic, or a Democratic government may become despotic, in practice, but in both cases there would be a departure from the standard of principle. Constitutions are either conventional, or written, embodying declarations of principle, and defining ultimate purposes; or they are the aggregated results of precedent, to be found in the experience of the past, or in the conclusions of Courts of justice and of equity, and established by prescriptive usage. The British Constitution is of the latter class. It is not written, in form, but is to be found in the acts and doings of the British nation, as recorded in history. The British government is one of growth, and not of conventional origin. It rests upon great principles, which have been developed by experience and established by the individual and collective wisdom of

the nation.¹ The great interests and rights of man have been discussed and tested by axioms of justice. The rights of society have been asserted, and the duties and prerogatives of government declared.² “Most of those who treat of the English Constitution,” says De Lolme, “consider it as a scheme of government formally planned and contrived by our ancestors, in some certain era of our national history, and as set up in pursuance of such regular plan and design. Something of this sort is secretly supposed or referred to, in the expressions of those, who speak of the ‘principles of the constitution,’ of bringing back the constitution to its ‘first principles,’ of restoring it to ‘its original purity,’ or principles.” * * *. “The constitution of England, like that of most countries of Europe, hath grown out of occasion and emergency; from the fluctuating policy of different ages, from the contentions, successes, interests, and opportunities, of different orders and parties of men in the community.”³

With a due allowance for a weakness which is as common as humanity, and as commendable as love of native soil, we are free to confess that there is much truth in the following passage from Hallam:

“No unbiassed observer, who derives pleasure from the welfare of his species, can fail to consider the long and uninterruptedly increasing prosperity of England as the most beautiful phenomenon in the history of mankind. Climates more propitious may impart more largely the mere enjoyments of existence; but in no other region have the benefits that political institutions can confer been diffused over so extended a population; nor have any people so well reconciled the discordant elements of wealth, order, and liberty. These advantages are surely not owing to the soil of this island, nor to the latitude in which it is placed; but to the spirit of its laws,

¹ In an essay published in 1772, Samuel Adams says, “Vattel tells us plainly and without hesitation ‘that the supreme legislative cannot change the constitution;’ that ‘their authority does not extend so far;’ and that ‘they ought to consider the fundamental laws as sacred, if the nation has not in very express terms given them power to change them. The constitution of the state ought to be fixed.”—*S. Adams*, VOL. I, p. 455. In a letter to a correspondent in London, dated Dec. 20, 1765, Adams says, “The British Constitution is founded in the principles of nature and reason.”—*Ibid*, VOL. I, p. 97.

² In a letter to Major John Cartwright, dated June 25th, 1824, Jefferson says,—“I have read your valuable volume on the British Constitution with pleasure and much

approbation, and think it has deduced the constitution of the English nation from its rightful root, the Anglo-Saxon. It is really wonderful, that so many able and learned men should have failed in their attempts to define it with correctness. Great authorities have declared, that the will of parliament is the constitution of England. So Marbois, before the French revolution, observed to me, that the *Almanac Royal* was the constitution of France.” * * * “It has ever appeared to me, that the difference between the whig and the tory of England is, that the whig deduces his rights from the Anglo-Saxon source, and the tory from the Norman.”—*Papers*, VOL. VII, pp. 855-6.

³ Stephens' edition, p. 4.

from which, through various means, the characteristic independence and industriousness of our nation have been derived. The Constitution, therefore, of England must be to inquisitive men of all countries, far more to ourselves, an object of superior interest; distinguished especially, as it is, from all free governments of powerful nations which history has recorded, by its manifesting, after the lapse of several centuries, not merely no symptom of irretrievable decay, but a more expansive energy. Comparing long periods of time, it may be justly asserted that the administration of government has progressively become more equitable, and the privileges of the subject more secure; and, though it would be both presumptuous and unwise to express an unlimited confidence as to the durability of liberties, which owe their greatest security to the constant suspicion of the people, yet, if we calmly reflect on the present aspect of this country, it will probably appear, that whatever perils may threaten our constitution are rather from circumstances altogether unconnected with it than from any intrinsic defects of its own."¹

While Hallam traces the national advantages of England to the spirit of the laws, he forgets to point out the origin of that spirit. The laws are dependent upon character, and character upon race. No one would admit that such laws could emanate from the Chinese, or from the African, or that either could administer them if placed in authority. Brief reference can only be made to the varied experience of England to indicate the numerous sources which have united to give birth to her highest claim to distinction and glory—the British Constitution. The chief glory of this, is its democracy.

Nothing could be more favorable to the developments of mind, than the displays and discipline of passion, the tests of pride, the adjustment of extreme and conflicting interests, the administration of justice, the perpetual difficulties of peace and war, to be found in the long and trying career of England.² From the reduction of numerous tribes to the Heptarchy,³

¹ Hallam, Vol. v, p. 1.

² It is always a privilege to put a tory on record when he speaks the truth. Bolingbroke says,—“If liberty be that delicious fruit, on which the British nation hath fed for so many ages, and to which we owe our riches, our strength, and all the advantages we boast of; the British Constitution is the tree, that bears this fruit, and will continue to bear it, as long as we are careful to fence it in, and trench it round, against the beasts of the field, and the insects of the earth.”—*Dissert. on Parties*, p. 191.

³ Lord Brougham says,—“The Constitutions of the Saxons appear to have been the same in the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy, and afterwards in the United Kingdom. The descent of the Crown was irregular, because the ideas of men on hereditary succession were not matured; and when a prince left a son, more especially if that son was very young, a dispute frequently arose between his claims and those of his grandfather's second son, that is, the young prince's elder paternal uncle. The choice in such cases devolved upon the leading men—the chief

and of the Heptarchy to a single monarchy, and during a long period of monarchical trials,—we find all the elements which are common to humanity ; of strength and weakness, of wisdom and folly, of integrity and perfidy, of refinement and barbarism, of honor and dishonor, of patriotism and treason, of ignorance and error,—and consequently of glory and shame.¹ Although there is much to excite commiseration and contempt, yet, there is more to admire than abhor, more to approve than condemn. Indeed, when we look to the rude chaos of barbarism of ancient Briton, and turn to the high civilization of the same country at the present time, we cannot but mingle our admiration with the sentiment of wonder,—in contemplating the beautiful certainties of progress. It has been truly said—that the glories of England are to be found in the British Constitution. It is the record of her deeds, conflicts and progress. It is one of diversity—and the enumeration can hardly be exhausted. The wars of races, the struggles and reduction of kingdoms, the supremacy and the impeachments of royalty ; the creation of councils and courts, of towns and counties ; the trial by jury, the rise and fall of feudalism ; the right of legislation, the Magna Charta, and the recognition of a constitution ;² the theory of nobility, the recogni-

land owners or thanes of the country ; and even when there existed no dispute, the form of an election appears in all cases to have been observed, and the sovereign is always said in the Chronicles to have been chosen King (*electus in Regum*).”—VOL. III, p. 197.

¹ “The cries of the people,” says Bolingbroke, “and the terror of approaching elections have defeated the most dangerous projects for beggaring and enslaving the nation ; and the majority *without doors* hath obliged the majority *within doors* to truckle to the *minority*. In a word, two things may be said with truth of our Constitution, which I think neither can, nor never could be said of any other. It secures society against the miseries, which are inseparable from simple forms of government, and is liable as little as possible to the inconveniences, that arise in mixed forms.”—*Dissert. on Parties*, p. 206.

² The formation and growth of towns and counties did not originate in England, though it may be said that their importance was there first demonstrated. They are the natural methods by which intelligent society is developed. They are not invented, but discovered as the obvious means of public

action. In respect to *Trial by Jury*, Hallam says, “It had been a prevailing opinion, that trial by jury may be referred to the Anglo-Saxon age, and common tradition has ascribed it to the wisdom of Alfred.” * *

“In comparing the various passages which I have quoted, it is impossible not to be struck with the preference given to twelve, or some multiple of it, in fixing the number either of judges or compurgators. This was not peculiar to England. Spelman has produced several instances of it in the early German laws. And that number seems to have been regarded with equal veneration in Scandinavia.” In speaking of *Magna Charta*, Hallam says,—“As this was the first effort towards a legal government, so it is beyond comparison the most important event in our history, except that Revolution without which its benefits would rapidly have been annihilated. The Constitution of England has indeed no single date from which its duration is to be reckoned. The institutions of positive law, the far more important changes which time has wrought in the order of society during six hundred years subsequent to the Great Charter, have undoubtedly lessened its direct application to our present circumstances. But it is still

tion of the Church, the organization of Parliament; the divisions of government, and the rights and prerogatives of each department; the responsibility of ministers, and the accountability of the Crown; the power of taxation, and the rights of suffrage; the extinction of villenage and slavery, the establishment of regencies and protectorates,—indeed, all that variety of measures which emanate from a low condition of necessity, or from a high condition of democracy,—and gradually give birth to laws which secure protection to society, and freedom and justice to man. All these slow processes of thought and wisdom, these periods of war and peace, these victories and defeats, successes and failures,—this long and fearful experience of more than eighteen hundred years, collected, shaped, and systematized by the most gifted minds of the nation, constitute the British Constitution.¹ If the skeptic desires to solve the great problem, the reality of progress, he has only to study the history of the British Constitution. It is a monument to wisdom, and though diffused through ages—it rises distinctly before us, in its moral proportions of grandeur, and the student of history will find no difficulty in appreciating the high encomiums upon it which have been so often uttered by illustrious men, and especially by our Fathers who participated in its glories before the Revolution. It is deemed proper thus to give a hasty sketch of what some superficial writers have derisively² denominated the “British Constitution,”—so that the reader may more fully understand the fearful responsibilities assumed by the Tory party—when they persistently violated some of its most obvious and sacred provisions, provisions as distinct and well defined by fact and analysis—as could be made by human judgment, or expressed by the power of language.

the key-stone of English liberty.”—*Middle Ages*, VOL. V, pp. 12, 15, 87.

¹ In speaking of the period of revolution, 1688, Prof. Smyth says,—“From a consideration of the debates and transactions of this period, the constitution appears to be in the act of assuming its last and more regular form. Its different parts must be looked upon as at that time falling, rather than as having already fallen into their appointed places. Thus, we have in the cabinet administrations made up of men differing from each other in their principles; in the Houses, the members of a party, often opposing the measures of their friends in office; the King giving his veto to bills that had passed the Houses, from his inability to resist them in any other manner; the decisions of the Commons, and even the

Lords, very uncertain; their debates stormy. Occurrences like these indicate a constitution settling, rather than settled.”—*Modern Hist.* p. 887. The same author remarks, and he utters a great truth,—“that the Revolution is still the great characteristic feature of our constitution and government. It must remain so.”—*Ib.* p. 424.

² It was one of the inquiries of Paine (*Crisis*) “Whether there is such a thing as the English constitution?” In his “Rights of Man,” he asks, “Can, then, Mr. Burke produce the English constitution? If he cannot, we may fairly conclude, that though it has been so much talked about, no such thing as a constitution exists, or ever did exist, and consequently the people have a constitution to form.”

Its great achievements have been those of Democracy. But allowing that certainty is reached in an accurate knowledge of principles, is there any rule by which to determine what may be denominated as the best form of government?

THE BEST FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

All men agree in expressing their wants and preferences, but they differ widely in their choice of means to secure them. All desire to be rich,—but with what diversity of plans, of folly, of wickedness; with what variety of success and failure. All desire to be happy,—but the want of self-knowledge, and the ignorance of mankind—lead to more errors than human wisdom can correct, to more misery than human weakness can bear. All desire to be eminent,—but how few have the genius to realize the promises of their aspirations, or the skill to rise above the ordinary distinction of mediocrity. Human judgment is not equal to the demands of human wishes. If this be true in the common affairs of life, how much more true when it is attempted to solve the difficult problems of government, and to decide what form is best. If man fails in meeting the expectations of one mind, or the wants of one family,—how can he hope to succeed in administering to the wants of millions who represent not only the conflicting interests of labor and commerce, but all the varied passions of men in their discords and harmony, in their conditions of frenzy and wickedness? But the question returns—What form of government is best? Many answer,—but few agree. All ask for the same results,—but with what discordant means!

The form of government—is simply the method of doing public business, and it has its origin in the circumstances and condition of the people who adopt it, and at the times when adopted. Absolutism prevails in the infancy of civilization, and democracy in the civilization of manhood. The highest form of which man is capable of administering is the democratic, and therefore the best. Its name implies the highest standard of principle—justice and equal rights to the people. The form of a government does not necessarily secure freedom, nor lead to tyranny. That form is best which is best systematized to meet the wants, and to advance the views of the people who adopt it. In fact—no other form is practicable.

The sentiment of the poet,

“For forms of government let fools contest;
What'er is best administered is best,”

is not to be commended, for in such a proposition both common sense and philosophy are entirely ignored. That the best form administered the best, would be superior to the worst form the best administered,—no one would venture to doubt. According to Plato—“Monarchy is the best government, or the worst.” This is ascribing all efficiency to administration, nothing

to the form. In supposing two forms in comparison, it must be borne in mind that the trial is to be made by the same degree of talent of administration in each, and under similar circumstances. In other words—all things being equal, except the form, the form becomes the characterizing agent. The requisite qualities and qualifications that would make a successful monarch, would not give success to a republican president. Each and every form of government has its distinctive spirit, or genius, and with this is combined the capacity for its administration, whether it be much, or little. Therefore, to compare the ultimate success of two forms of government, administered by unequal agents, with a view to establishing a preference based upon experiment, would be useless. This proposition is made still more obvious, when two kings under the same monarchy, or two presidents under the same republic,—are compared in view either of their success or failure. The success or failure of either may not be attributable to the form of government, so much as the ability, or the want of it, in its administration. In speaking of ability, the word is used in its comprehensive sense, and made to embrace character as well as knowledge. The requisite character, the requisite knowledge. All governments may essentially be classed under two forms—the Monarchical, and the Republican.

MONARCHY.

A Monarchy is a government of a single person, although the name is retained when the power of the monarch is restrained or limited by legislation. The fact of its being hereditary, or constitutional—does not take away its name though its strict definition is abandoned.¹ Aristotle claimed that monarchy was the first form of government established by nature, and this was asserted by Polybius. By some its origin has been traced to Divinity and it was assumed that it was an unpardonable sin to oppose it. Just before his execution, Charles I. declared—"that contempt of the rights of the sovereign was the true cause of the people's misfortunes, that the people ought to have no share in the government, that upon this condition alone would the country regain peace and its liberties." He claimed to be king by grace of God. All things were *A Deo et rege*.² This doc-

¹ A monarchy, is that form, in which the will of one man, styled monarch, emperor, king, or otherwise, is the supreme law of the nation. If his will is restricted by charters, constitutions, or other means, the monarchy is said to be *constitutional* or *limited*; but if not, it is called an *absolute monarchy* or *despotism*. A *mixed monarchy* is one in which the supreme power is shared with

the nobles, or people, or both. *Park's Pantomology*.

² "First of all comes monarchy," says Polybius, "which is established by the bare work of nature, independently of any preparation or design."

³ "It was gravely maintained," says Macaulay, "that the Supreme Being regarded hereditary monarchy, as opposed to

trine was publicly abandoned—although it would not be difficult to find its adherents in all ages. It has been alternately denounced and commended by the same people. Its admirers boast of its vigor and promptness, both at home and abroad, in asserting justice and in defending the rights of its subjects. They claim that it commands unity and efficiency,—not being so liable as Republics to distracting counsels. They claim that it is conducive to honor, and favorable to chivalry, that its patronage advances the arts and sciences—by its gifts and distinctions. It is asserted, too, that its rule is more permanent than that of republics, and that the dangers of a selfish ambition are not so likely to divide and irritate the people—who are secured in “the hereditary principle of succession in perfection.”¹ Montesquieu, speaking of the genius of a monarchy, and quoting the political testament of Cardinal Richelieu, says,—“If, there should chance to be some unlucky honest man among the people, a prince should take care not to employ him. So true is it that virtue is not the spring of this government.”²

This subject was discussed by John Dickinson, an able and distinguished member of a convention assembled in Pennsylvania, to consider the great theme of independence.

other forms of government, with peculiar favor; that the rule of succession in order of primogeniture was a divine institution, anterior to the Christian, and even to the Mosaic dispensation; that no human power, not even that of the whole Legislature—no length of adverse possession, though it extended to ten centuries, could deprive the legitimate prince of his rights; that his authority was always necessarily despotic; that the laws by which, in England and in other countries, the prerogative was limited, were to be regarded merely as concessions which the sovereign had freely made and might at pleasure resume; and that any treaty into which a king might enter with his people was merely a declaration of his present intentions, and not a contract of which the performance could be demanded. It was at this time that those strange theories which Filmer afterward formed into a system, and which became the badge of the most violent class of Tories and High-churchmen—first emerged into notice.” *Hist. England*, VOL. I, p. 66.

¹“The effects of pure monarchy,” says Lord Brougham, “and its companion ari-

toocracy, upon the character and habits of the nation are easily traced. The tendency is towards making men regard only their superiors. The will of the court and upper classes becomes the law, and their habits the example for all. Court favor and the countenance of nobles are the objects of universal pursuit. The sterling, the manly virtues are little cultivated. Personal courage, honorable feelings, public spirit, exist in the upper classes, and exist in good measure; but it is to please and serve the masters of the State.” * * * “There is one virtue which this constitution and all monarchy possesses beyond any other, the fixed order of succession by inheritance.” * * * “Elective monarchy is of all forms of government the worst and the most inconsistent with itself.” * * * “No absolute monarchy can exist without the rule of inheritance; no limited monarchy can well exist without it. When the people are fit to be entrusted with the choice of their chief magistrate, they are fit for living under a commonwealth.” *Polit. Philos.*, VOL. I, p. 163.

²*Esprit des Loix* 1, III, c. 5

"I know," said he, "the name of liberty is dear to each one of us; but have we not enjoyed liberty even under the English monarchy? Shall we this day renounce that, to go and seek it in I know not what form of republic, which will soon change into a licentious anarchy and popular tyranny? In the human body the head only sustains and governs all the members, directing them, with admirable harmony, to the same object, which is self-preservation and happiness; so the head of the body politic, that is, the king in concert with the parliament, can alone maintain the members of this empire, lately so flourishing, and prevent civil war by obviating all the evils produced by variety of opinion and diversity of interests. And so firm is my persuasion of this, that I firmly believe the most cruel war which Great Britain could make upon us, would be that of not making any; and that the surest means of bringing us back to her obedience, would be that of employing none."

This example from nature in defence of monarchy fails entirely when examined. If the head truly represents the king—it must be a king without subjects, and a sceptre without a kingdom. The head, or the brain is the seat of consciousness, the organ of the mind, and no other member of the body is invested with such a function or capacity. And who is to be king,—the person of royal birth but with an idiot's brain, or the peasant with the head of a Washington, or a Franklin? "I affirm," says Victor Hugo, "in the name of the eternal laws of human morality, that Monarchy is an historical fact, and nothing more."¹ But Mr. Dickinson leaves nature and turns to history. He continues,—

"There are many persons, who, to gain their ends, extol the advantages of a republic over monarchy. I will not here undertake to examine which of these two forms of government merits the preference. I know, however, that the English nation, after having tried them both, has never found repose except in monarchy. I know, also, that in popular republics themselves, so necessary is monarchy to cement human society, it has been requisite to institute monarchical powers, more or less extensive, under the names of Archons, of Consuls, of Doges, of Gonfalioniers, and finally of Kings."² Nor should I here omit an observation, the truth of which appears

¹ Speech on the question of revising the French Constitution, 1851.

² The following "Royal Pedigree" of England, was published during the American Revolution,—supposed to be written by Thomas Paine: "George the Third, who was the grandson of George the Second, who was the son of George the First, who was the son of the Princess Sophia, who

was the cousin of Anne, who was the sister of William and Mary, who were the daughter and son-in-law of James the Second, who was the son of Charles the First, who was a traitor to his country and decapitated as such, who was the son of James the First, who was the son of Mary, who was the sister of Edward the Sixth, who was the son of Henry the Eighth, who was the

to me incontestable; the English Constitution seems to be the fruit of the experience of all anterior time; in which monarchy is so tempered, that the monarch finds himself checked in his efforts to seize absolute power; and the authority of the people is so regulated, that anarchy is not to be feared. But for us it is to be apprehended, that when the counterpoise of monarchy shall no longer exist, the democratic power may carry all before it, and involve the whole in confusion and ruin. Then an ambitious citizen may arise, seize the reins of power, and annihilate liberty forever; for such is the ordinary career of ill-balanced democracies, they fall into anarchy, and thence under despotism."

Mr. Dickinson is quoted as a representative thinker of the times, and as an unexceptionable exponent of a party then existing both in America and England. He was a democrat, but a monarchist.¹ There were many such.

cold-blooded murderer of his wives, and the promoter of the Protestant religion, who was the son of Henry the Seventh, who slew Richard the Third, who smothered his nephew Edward the Fifth, who was the son of Edward the Fourth, who with bloody Richard slew Henry the Sixth, who succeeded Henry the Fifth, who was the son of Henry the Fourth, who was the cousin of Richard the Second, who was the son of Edward the Third, who was the son of Richard the Second, who was the son of Edward the First, who was the son of Henry the Third, who was the son of John, who was brother of Richard the First, who was the son of Henry the Second, who was the son of Matilda, who was the daughter of Henry the First, who was the brother of William Rufus, who was the son of William the Conqueror, who was the son of a whore."

Guizot asks, "For what have nations blessed kings? Was it for their pretensions to divine right, to absolute power? For their profusion? For their courts? No; kings assailed the feudal system and aristocratical privileges; they introduced unity into legislation, and into the executive administration; they aided the progress of equality."—*Rev. England*, p. 11.

¹ John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, was a writer of great influence at an early period of the Revolution. He commenced his celebrated "*Farmer's Letters*," in the fall of 1767. Samuel Adams "was so pleased with

the purity of style and devoted patriotism of those writings," says his biographer, "that he repeatedly quoted them in his own essays, as if anxious that the New England people should not miss their benign influence. No man south of Massachusetts had done so much in the press as Dickinson to support the popular cause."—VOL. II, p. 58. Adams was poor, Dickinson was a gentleman of leisure, and wealthy. The former a republican democrat, the latter a monarchical democrat. In comparing them, Mr. Wells says,—"There was a wide difference between the two men. Both were ardently devoted to American liberty, each was recognized as the ablest writer in his section of the continent, and each commanded public respect by his unaffected piety and love of justice. But while the most cherished wish of Adams was the total independence of his country, Dickinson, who for some time influenced Pennsylvania through the general admiration of his character, shrunk from such a thought, and longed for nothing more than conciliation."—*Ibid.* 58. In a letter to him dated March 27th, 1773, Mr. Adams says,—"Could your health or leisure admit of it, a publication of your sentiments on this and other matters of the most interesting importance would be of substantial advantage to your country." In reply, the next month, Mr. Dickinson says,—"My heart is devoted with the most ardent affection to the interests of my countrymen. I

They did not look for democracy in the form of the government, so much, as in the administration of it. They had studied but little beyond the principles of the Revolution of 1688. This subject will be further elucidated in other chapters.

Mr. Dickinson speaks of the fact that England had tried both forms of government, the monarchical and republican, but he omitted the more important fact, that the experiment of republicanism was by means of revolution, and not by growth and preparation. The Commonwealth of Cromwell was of spasmodic formation, a struggle to create separate and independent parts, from centralized power, instead of finding parts duly prepared to be brought together as a whole. It must be remembered that the true basis of a republic is to be found in the subdivisions of society, each subdivision having a distinct and mature organization of its own, and in addition, in some degree, a federal experience. And when Mr. Dickinson speaks in terms of admiration of the English Constitution, and of its checks upon the King,—he fails to give a correct analysis even of his own faith. The progress of freedom has its securities in the advancing intelligence of the people, and as they prepare themselves for self-government—they gradually and slowly assume the power surrendered by royalty. It passes from the King to the people,—not by enactment but by their improved condition to act for themselves. The fountain is not lowered, but the streams are raised. It is the nature of mental power to assert its own strength and dignity, and to claim to exercise its own conscious prerogatives.

That the eloquence of Mr. Dickinson made no impression upon the people, and that such a speech would jeopard his position as a public man¹ might

join in their opposition to the encroachments from Great Britain from two motives,—a love of liberty and a love of peace.” * * “But, sir, though these are my sentiments, I must beg you will please to excuse me from enlarging on them in any publication.”—*Ibid*, VOL. II, p. 1.

“Every move toward independence,” says Wells, “was opposed with the whole power of Dickinson, who, in addition to his former prejudice against the Northern members, had taken a dislike to John Adams, owing to a slighting remark contained in some letters which had been intercepted by the British, and published.”—*Ibid*, VOL. II, p. 824. And yet, in a royal proclamation sent to General Gage in Feb., 1775,—a list of rebels was made, “with a blank commission to try and execute such of them as he could get hold of,” in which was included the names of

Samuel Adams, John Adams, John Hancock, John Dickinson and others. In a letter to Arthur Lee, dated Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1741, Dickinson earnestly speaks of “the great struggle for the blessing of liberty—a blessing that can alone render life worth holding,” and adds,—“Give up the Butes, Mansfields, Norths, Bernards, and Hutchinsons, whose falsehoods and misrepresentations have inflamed the people; call not their cause the cause of Great Britain; throw all errors and occasions of dissatisfactions on their guilty heads.”—*Am. Archives*, VOL. I, 4th series, p. 947. A more determined opponent to the Tory party could not be found, but he did not sympathize with the republicans.

¹“The discourse of Dickinson,” says Botta, “was heard with attention; but the current flowed irresistibly strong in a con-

have been expected. Republicanism was no new subject in England, it was no new subject in the Colonies, and it cannot be denied that all the circumstances connected with the early settlement and growth of the colonies were anything but favorable to monarchy.¹ It was natural that monarchy should be favored by the recipients of royal patronage, and that the spirit of aristocracy, which is slow to yield to popular rights, should oppose republicanism. It seemed like dangerous presumption. Some minds are so constituted as not to be able to see the safety of concessions to freedom, to be willing to recognize the merits of progress,—but seem to be incapable of detaching the future from the chronic frame-work of the past. Old institutions become sacred, ancestral associations are captivating to the sentimental mind. A titled gentry, a royal pedigree, a brilliant court and inherited wealth; liberal patrons of the arts and trades; the creators and followers of fashion, and the leaders of pastime,—make an atmosphere of nominal grandeur, and once breathed by the child and enjoyed by the man,—it is not easy to reverse established preferences, or to see prudence in change.² King and Prince, the royal family in its sacred reserves; impos-

trary direction, and fear acting upon many more powerfully than even their opinion, the majority pronounced in favor of independence." Dickinson was excluded.—VOL. I, p. 355.

¹In a letter to John Jay, dated Aug. 1, 1786, Washington says, "What astonishing changes a few years are capable of producing. I am told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking; hence to acting is often but a single step. But how irrevocable and tremendous! What a triumph for our enemies to verify their predictions!"—*Sparks*, VOL. IX, p. 189.

In a letter to Washington, dated Paris, May 2, 1788, Jefferson writes,—"I was much an enemy to monarchies before I came to Europe. I am ten thousand times more so, since I have seen what they are."—*Jefferson Papers*, VOL. II, p. 375.

In a letter to Benj. Kent, dated July 27, 1776—Samuel Adams writes,—"New governments are now erecting in the several American States under the authority of the people. Monarchy seems to be generally exploded; and it is not a little surprising to me that the aristocratic spirit, which ap-

peared to have taken deep root in some of them, now gives place to democracy."—VOL. II, p. 435. De Tocqueville, writing more than half a century later, says,—"I have visited the two nations in which the system of provincial liberty has been most perfectly established, and I have listened to the opinions of different parties in those countries. In America I met with men who secretly aspired to destroy the democratic institutions of the Union; in England I found others who attacked the aristocracy openly; but I know of no one who does not regard provincial independence as a great benefit. In both countries I have heard a thousand different causes assigned for the evils of the State; but the local system was never mentioned amongst them."—VOL. I, p. 77. This is high authority in favor of republicanism from abroad,—and yet, to-day, there are monarchists in America! Subjects, and principles, and parties, remain the same.

²In November, 1775, on the subject of treating with the Americans, in the House of Commons, Temple Luttrell said,—"Of thirty-three sovereigns of England, since William the Conqueror, thirteen only have ascended the throne by divine hereditary right; the rest owe their royalty to the zeal

ing retinues and palatial splendors; the formal exercise of the prerogatives of royalty, and the impressive dignity of state,—all conspire to invest monarchy with an importance which awes the humble, and exalts the proud. Some men love to be counted a part of an imposing establishment, and if it can be found in the necessities of government, it is readily favored on personal considerations though with an avowed belief that it is demanded by the public good. Lord Brougham says,—“Monarchy is naturally extravagant—it is splendid and it is expensive—it is reckless of the general suffering from the burdens of taxation; and it is prone to consider only the interests and enjoyments of courts and persons in authority.”

The discussion of this subject by Cromwell and his partisans had not been forgotten.¹ Their views had been transmitted and fostered, and a considerable portion of the British nation, at home and abroad, were settled in the belief that monarchy was no longer indispensable to their prosperity, though England was not permanently prepared for the higher responsibilities of a republic.²

and vigor of the people in the maintenance of constitutional freedom. The will of the people of England, superseding an hereditary claim to succession, at the commencement of the 12th century, placed Henry the First on the throne of this kingdom, with condition that he would abrogate the vigorous laws made since the Norman invasion, restore the government as in the days of Edward the Confessor, and abolish all unjust and arbitrary taxes. King Stephen obtained the crown, and Henry the Second kept it, on the same express terms; yet, sir, in the days of King John, it was judged expedient no longer to trust to mere oral declarations, which state chicane and sophistry had of late years occasionally explained away, but to compel that prince solemnly to register an affirmance of the ancient rights of the people in a formal charter; and this necessary work was accomplished by the congress at Runemede, in the year 1215; an assembly which ought never to be spoken of by the representatives of the Commons of England but with profound veneration.”—*Parl. Deb.* Vol. XVIII, p. 865.

¹ In a conference with his political leaders, Cromwell said, “that they should in concert investigate what government best suited England, as it was now their part to regu-

late it. Ludlow, Vane, Hutchinson, Sidney, and Haslerig, loudly declared their feelings, rejecting all idea of a monarchy as condemned by the Bible, by reason, and by experience. The generals were more reserved.—(*Guizot's Eng. Rev.* pp. 875–6.)

² “Like Moses,” said Hugh Peters to the generals, in a sermon to the remnant of the two houses,—“like Moses, you are destined to take the people out of the bondage of Egypt; how will this be accomplished? that is what has not been revealed?” He put his hands before his eyes, laid his head on the cushion, and, rising thence suddenly, exclaimed, “Now I have it, by revelation! Now I shall tell you! This army must root up monarchy, not only here, but in France, and other kingdoms round about; this is to bring you out of Egypt. This army is that corner-stone, cut out of the mountain, which must dash the powers of the earth to pieces.” On the day of the execution of Charles the First,—the Commons passed an ordinance, declaring whomsoever should proclaim in his stead and as his successor, “Charles Stuart his son, commonly called Prince of Wales, or any other person whatsoever, a traitor.” On the 6th of February, 1648, after a long discussion, the House of Lords was solemnly abolished—by a vote of

On the subject of monarchy, the Colonists were divided in view of Scripture authority. On all subjects of government, they looked to the Bible for Divine guidance, not only as to the measures of government, but the form of government. The discussion was earnest, solemn and learned. The Bible was studied and reviewed with the nicest precision to settle the great question—whether God had directly or indirectly indicated His Will as to the best form of human government. The anti-monarchists were so extravagant in their denunciations of monarchy, derived from Scriptural authority, that the friends of monarchy were more bent to expose their errors of construction than to establish their own views of government. Monarchists could live without monarchy, though they protested against the exaggerations of its evils, and against the perversion of Scripture authority. The English clergy, it may be said, were generally in favor of a monarchy as they claimed for themselves the high privilege of being the special interpreters of God's Will as revealed in the Holy Bible, and as it is made known in Providence. As the established Church was a recognized element of the government, it was natural that its ministers should feel persuaded to seek evidence to prove that what had been so long permitted by God should be continued to be classed as one of his Ordinances. Tories were monarchists—by sympathy with the conservative rule of royalty, as they were unable to comprehend how reforms could be favored or tolerated without danger to the hereditary rights of the Crown. The Puritans were resigned to either form of government. That republicanism was their choice, there can be no doubt, but they were not prepared to inaugurate revolution on such an issue. When Charles I. was beheaded they expressed their belief that the hand of God was in the promotion of Cromwell. When Cromwell was deposed they saw nothing but justice in the royal order for the arrest of the regicides.¹

44 to 29. The next day, the 7th, they voted to abolish the office of a king.—(Guizot's Eng. Rev., pp. 410, 436.

In his chapter on "Monarchical and Regal Republics, John Adams says,—“The agrarian (the land) in America is divided among the common people in every state, in such a manner, that nineteen-twentieths of the property would be in the hands of the commons, let them appoint who they could for chief magistrate and senators. The sovereignty then, in fact, as well as morality, must reside in the whole body of the people; and a hereditary king and nobility, who should not govern according to public opinion, would infallibly be tumbled

instantly from their places.”—VOL. IV, p. 359.

¹An Address of the General Court of Massachusetts, to Oliver Cromwell, Aug. 14, 1654,—is commenced in the following language: “May it please your Highness, It hath beene no smal comfort to us poor exiles, in these utmost ends of the earth (who sometimes felt and often feared the frownes of the mighty) to have had the experience of the good hand of God, in raising up such, whose endeavors have not beene wantinge to our welfare: amongst whom, we have good cause to give your highness the first place.”—*Hutchinson's Mass.*, p. 523, *Appendix*. In Declaration of Rights—made at the Sessions of the General

That monarchy was not considered the issue of the Revolution—may be inferred from a remark of John Adams, in a letter to Lafayette, as late as 1782. “I am not, however,” said he, “an enthusiast who wishes to overturn empires and monarchies for the sake of introducing republican forms of government, and, therefore, I am no king-killer, king-hater, or king-despiser.”¹

Although the subject was discussed with an apparent independence and thoroughness, yet it was easy to discover that the defenders of monarchy were not ignorant of the prejudices of the people against them, and that their theory if it amounted to anything, proved too much. It is quite certain that monarchy did not emigrate from the old country to the new² and that while there was a possibility of a reconciliation between the government and the Colonies,—no one was disposed to say too much to render it difficult to retrace his steps if the people should refuse to adopt his conclusions. One of the most laborious writers, after exhausting his wisdom and learning, in reply to the author of “Common Sense,” was willing to dismiss the controversy with the remark that—“It might be well for the author of ‘Common Sense’—to follow the example of Acherley³ in his future works, without stirring up an old dispute, of which our Fathers were long since wearied.” Acherley was a good Democrat, and was therefore counted as good authority against a democrat in a controversy with a Tory.

“Upon the whole matter,” says Cato,⁴ “I contend for this: That where a people are left to choose their own forms of government, as has been the case of all the world for some thousand years, there is no particular denunciation of *God’s* displeasure against any form, whether monarchical or democratical, under which such a people may think their civil happiness

Court, held at Boston the 10th of June, 1661, the following language appears under the head of “Our duties of allegiance to our souevrigne lord the King.” “We further judge, that the warrant and letter from the King’s Majesty for the apprehending of Colonell Whalley and Colonell Goffe, ought to be diligently and faithfully executed by the authority of this court.”—*Ibid.*, p. 531.

¹ “There are three monarchs,” says Mr. Adams, “in Europe for whom I have as much veneration as it is lawful for one man to have for another,—The King of France, the Emperor of Germany, and the King of Prussia, are constant objects of my admiration, for reasons of humanity, wisdom, and beneficence, which need not be enlarged on.”—VOL. VII, p. 598.

² “Of the institutions of the Old World,” says Bancroft, “monarchy had no motive to emigrate, and was present only by its shadow; in the proprietary governments, by the shadow of a shadow.”—VOL. II, p. 451.

³ Allibone gives a list of *Roger Acherley’s* writings: *Britannic Constitution*; or the *Fundamental Form of Government in Britain*, demonstrating the original Contract entered into by the King and people, *Lond.*, 1727. *The Free Parliament*, 1731, 8 vo. *Reasons for Uniformity in the State*: being a Supplement to the *Britannic Constitution*, 1780, 8 vo.

⁴ “Cato”—was Dr. Smith, of Philadelphia, [See *Am. Archives*,—VOL. V.]

best secured, and their duty to God best performed. *Acherley* shall again shelter me in this conclusion, which is the main purport of the present letter: '*Jesus Christ* left all the potentates of this world and their subjects to decide their several rights by the temporal laws of each nation; and never intimated what form of government was most convenient or eligible.' This directly contradicts our author,¹ who says that the Almighty has entered his protest against the particular form of monarchy."²

The friends of monarchy were too well informed respecting the public opinion in the colonies, not to see the imprudence of any but considerate language. Their views were opposed with boldness and bitterness by republicans, and with so much earnestness that no credit was given for any avowed willingness to reconcile colonial differences. The colonies were denounced as enemies to the Crown from the first, and if they had the prudence to say nothing against monarchy, they gave no evidence that they did not intend republicanism. They were accused of cant and insincerity. That their language justified the belief that there was a latent hostility which only required an occasion for development,—there can be no reasonable doubt. This hostility was soon made manifest both in speech and acts, and it found a prompt response in a large majority of the people.

The leading Democrats of America did not hesitate freely to express their opinions of monarchy, and more particularly when they saw but little chance for a reconciliation between the two countries. They took a common sense view of the subject, and as they could find no evidence that Kings ruled by Divine right, they were conscious of no duty based upon such an assumption. The effusions of Hugh Peters had their advocates and admirers, and if monarchy had not been rooted up in the time of Cromwell, it was doubtless believed that it could be rooted up—in the land of Washington.

In the early periods of the world, it was claimed, there were no kings,³ and that there were no distinctions in birth recognized by nature. All men were born alike, and all with equal right to rule. Sex was the only distinction of nature, and to be good or bad were the distinctions of heaven.⁴ All the inequalities of society were traced to the individual, and the theory of Locke, that every person could be the creator of his own character, was

¹ Author of "Common Sense."

² Am. Archives, 4th Series, Vol. v, p. 848.

³ "In the early ages of the world," says the author of "Common Sense," "according to the Scripture chronology, there were no kings; the consequence of which was there were no wars; it is the pride of kings which throws mankind into confusion. Holland, without a king, hath enjoyed more peace

for the last century [1776] than any of the monarchical governments of Europe. Antiquity favors the same remark; for the quiet and rural lives of the first patriarchs have a happy something in them, which vanishes when we come to the history of Jewish royalty."—Vol. 1, p. 25.)

⁴ Ibid.

the early belief and philosophy. At that time but little had been published to establish any theory respecting the different races of man, though the practical judgment was the same then as now. There is a judgment which we can always see in the practice of men, and there is another to be found in their opinions. It is the business of history and science so far as it is possible—to harmonize the two. It was asserted that monarchy was not only a sin, but a failure. That it was a punishment for the Jews, and an imposition on posterity. It was held even to be blasphemous, and strong enough of itself to stand without God—if the Devil were not restrained. It was asserted that the “Palaces of Kings were built on the ruins of Paradise.” The Crown had discovered no wisdom above the ordinary examples of life, and upon the whole it was thought that the Governors appointed by the King were not to be trusted. It was believed by many that the Colonies had no enemy so dangerous as the King, and to manifest their contempt towards him,—his name and portrait were frequently treated with marked indignities.¹ Kings were viewed by some, indeed, as unscrupulous and ambitious leaders, rather preferring the exciting and diverting scenes of war than the humanizing arts of peace. But all these worldly considerations had but little weight with the colonists compared to the sacred authority of the Bible. The Scriptures were searched with zeal and confidence, numerous passages were quoted to show that monarchy was abhorred of God,—and that those who favored it could not be within the pale of his favor.² The examples of Gideon and Samuel were quoted by the friends of Republicanism, but not without counter interpretations from tory writers.

On the supposition that the race of kings in England had an illustrious origin, it was contended that it was beneath the true dignity of man to recognize a custom, or tradition,—founded upon accident, or temporary convenience, and which was practically a method of proceeding no higher than mere luck, or lot. To choose by lot admits of no rule founded on judgment, and it can be regarded no better than gambling for the best interests of society. If by usurpation,—it would be a perpetual example to justify revolution, and there could be no peace. If by election, the choice would be made upon some principle, and a precedent established, but in no

¹ John Adams, in his *Diary*, (1777,) says, —“They have a fashion, in this town, of reversing the picture of King George III., in such families as have it. One of these topsy-turvy kings was hung up in the room where we supped, and under it were written these lines, by Mr. Throop, as we are told :

“Behold the man, who had it in his power
To make a kingdom tremble and adore,
Intoxicate with Folly. See his head
Placed where the meanest of his subjects tread.
Like Lucifer, the giddy tyrant fell ;
He lifts his heel to Heaven, but points his head to
H—l.”
—*Life and Works*, VOL. II, p. 434.

² Judges, Ch. VIII, 22, 28,—I. Samuel, VIII, 5, 6, 10–18; XII, 18, 19.

way giving to the possession of power a hereditary element. At all events, the colonists saw no particular reason for honoring a government of such questionable origin, and they were slow to believe it to be their duty to compromise either their proper self respect, or their rights to equality, in matters of government in violation of all constitutional guarantees.

It is instructive to see how the same monarchy is regarded by the different parties of the same nation. The troubles or irregularities of a people instantly afford an index to their party proclivities. When an intelligent people suffer it is their nature to complain. Their complaints become the subject of inquiry and discussion, and every party proposes a remedy according to its own faith. The Tory sees his opportunity to acquire power by becoming an alarmist. He magnifies disturbances into dangers. He knows no remedy but in control, and while he is forward to speak of the existence of difficulties to their fullest extent, he is careful to give no counsel affording relief that either implies sympathy for suffering, or confidence in man. He believes in arbitrary power and coercion, will and command. The Democrat seeks remedies in the opposite direction. He confers with the people, and trusts them.¹ Both may commit extremes. One by trusting too much, the other too little.

During the French Revolution, embracing a period from 1789 to 1795 the people of all nations looked upon the events of the bloody struggle with kindred and opposite emotions and opinions.² The Tories everywhere

¹ In debate on the "Treasonable Practices Bill," in the House of Lords, the Bishop of Rochester said, "he did not know what the mass of the people in any country had to do with the laws but to obey them, with the reserve of their undoubted right to petition against any particular law, as a grievance on a particular description of people."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 258. The Earl of Lauderdale said, in reply, "If he had been in Turkey, and had heard such a declaration from the mouth of a Mufti, he should have attributed it to his ignorance, the despotic government of his country, or the bias of his religious opinions; but to hear a British prelate, in a British house of parliament, declare that he did not know what the people had to do with the laws but to obey them, filled him with wonder and astonishment."

—*Parl. Deb.*, XXXII, p. 258. The Bishop in a subsequent debate explained his declaration, (*P. D.* p. 265) but with a tory spirit. The Earl of Abingdon, in a brief reply, said,

"He would ask the reverend prelate, whether *Vox populi* was not *Vox Dei*? He would prove it was; and that God Almighty always inspired the people upon such occasions, and would do so still: he would prove this by authors as old as Methuselah. If the bill passed, resistance to it might be deemed rebellion, but if the compact settled by the Bill of Rights was broken, the government might happen to be in a state of rebellion against the people. His lordship added, that the arguments he had heard that day, appeared to him to be calculated to enforce the exploded principle of passive obedience and non-resistance, and that all who maintained such doctrine, whether bishops or lay peers, were damned beyond all possibility of redemption, by revolutionary principles."—*Ibid.*, p. 270.

² An English writer says,—"Hostility to France might almost be called an ingredient in the principle of Whiggism; favor toward it had always distinguished the Tories."

asserted their favorite theory of a strong government, in special legislation, —always forgetting that their appointed guardians of humanity have no elements of character above those to be found in the people who are to be their subjects. The results of the American Revolution inspired new hopes in the breasts of the oppressed in all lands, and corresponding fears in their oppressors. Party lines were deeply drawn between freedom and arbitrary power, and partisans in England and America became active in manifesting their sympathies where they had no special interests to promote or defend. The cause of liberty was made an outward movement of the world, comprehending all the means of advancement that were possible or impossible, and it was desperately opposed by the party of an inward policy, the party of centralization. One party was as wild and extravagant in its designs to extend the area of freedom, as the other was in limiting it. One was led by an illimitable faith in the capacity of man for self-government, the other was swayed by real or pretended fears of ruin and anarchy, and by an absurd confidence in the few at the expense of the many.

This was considered as a fearful crisis in England. It was viewed as a conflict between monarchy and republicanism. The slightest disturbance among the people, the confident assertions of popular leaders were looked upon by the Tories with alarm. They erected their sensitive and variable standard of loyalty,—and Democrats were placed under the ban of royal proclamations and new sedition laws.¹ The King was assaulted in his carriage and treated with disrespect by a turbulent populace. Because one man was capable of outrage, all men were counted as capable of rebellion. Because there were revolutionary troubles in France, and republicanism in America, there could be no constitutional government in England. The

Hist. of Parties, Vol. II, p. 408. The prejudices of the English against the French is one thing. This is a subject of race. When France is democratic,—she has the sympathy of democrats everywhere, in all nations, and without regard to race.

¹ Nov. 23, 1795, Numerous Petitions were presented to the House of Commons against the Treason and Sedition bills. Of these, the Annual Register (1796) says,—“The public was no less occupied than parliament itself, in the discussion of the two bills. Clubs and Associations were formed everywhere for the purpose of opposing them by every method not liable to the cognizance of the law. Never had there appeared, in the memory of the oldest man, so firm and decided a plurality of adversaries to the

ministerial measures as on this occasion; the interest of the public seemed so deeply at stake, that individuals not only of the decent, but of the most vulgar professions, gave up a considerable portion of their time and occupations in attending to the numerous meetings that were called in every part of the kingdom, to the professed intent of counteracting this attempt of the ministry. The Whig club, comprising not a few individuals of the first rank and property in the kingdom, led the way in this celebrated opposition.

“The corresponding Society’s numerous members, together with an immense multitude of their adherents and well-wishers, assembled on the 12th of November, in the fields near Copenhagen House. Here they

Whigs arraigned a tory partisan for a libel upon Parliament,¹ and a tory Parliament enacted special laws to protect the kingdom against imaginary schemes of the Whigs. The Whigs saw no incompatibility between govern-

solemnly denied all intentions of raising commotions, and disproved the charge brought against them, by ministry, of being concerned in the outrages committed against the king. They framed three petitions, one to the King, and the two others to the Lords and Commons; stating them to be the unanimous petitions of nearly 400,000 British subjects, met together to communicate their sentiments, and express them freely, as authorized to do by the Bill of Rights, on the measures of ministry, which tended to invade the liberties invested in them by the constitution. They supplicated, therefore, the King to exert his royal authority, in the preservation of his people's rights, directly threatened by the two bills brought forward by his ministers; and they requested the two Houses to interfere in behalf of the public, against the ministerial attempt to procure their passing. The livery of London, the electors of Westminster, and the freeholders of Middlesex, agreed to remonstrances and petitions of the like nature, and were followed by a number of counties, and almost every town of note in the kingdom."

¹In the House of Commons, Nov. 23, 1795, Mr. Sturt presented a petition signed by 12,118 persons, purporting to be the petition of the London Corresponding Society against the treason and sedition bills, justified that Society from the aspersions thrown out against them and their writings; and to prove that things at least as exceptionable had appeared from the partisans of the ministry, he read to the House several passages from a pamphlet entitled, "Thoughts on the English Government," written by John Reeves, the framer and president of the Association against Republicans and Levellers, and among others the following:

"With the exception of the advice and consent of the two Houses of Parliament, and the interposition of juries, the government, and the administration of it in all its

parts, may be said to rest wholly and solely on the king, and those appointed by him. Those two adjuncts of parliament and juries are subsidiary and occasional: but the king's power is a substantive one, always visible and active. By his officers, and in his name, everything is transacted that relates to the peace of the realm and the protection of the subject. The subject feels this, and acknowledges with thankfulness a superintending sovereignty, which alone is congenial to the sentiments and temper of Englishmen. In fine, the government of England is a monarchy; the monarchy is the ancient stock from which we have sprung these goodly branches of the legislature, the Lords and Commons, that at the same time give ornament to the tree, and afford shelter to those who seek protection under it. But these are still only branches, and derive their origin and their nutriment from their common parent; they may be lopped off, and the tree is a tree still; shorn, indeed, of its honours, but not like them, cast into the fire. The kingly government may go on in all its functions, without Lords or Commons, it has heretofore done so for years together, and in our times it does so during every recess of parliament; but without the king, his parliament is no more. The king, therefore, alone it is who necessarily subsists without change or diminution; and from him alone we unceasingly derive the protection of law and government." Mr. Sturt then moved, that "the House do order the attorney-general to prosecute the author of the said pamphlet."

The Chancellor of Exchequer (Wm. Pitt, the junior,) thought, instead of recommending the attorney-general to prosecute, the House should vindicate its privileges by acts of its own. However, he was at present for passing to the order of the day."

Charles James Fox considered the objection which had been started by the chancellor of the exchequer the strangest he had

ment and freedom. They could be true to the one and save the other. The tories looked for safety in "party vigor beyond the law," in the employment of spies and informers, and in the discovery of "new treasons."¹ The one saw treason in freedom, the other in tyranny. The one looked for justice in the form of government without principle, the other in its constitutional administration according to principle. The extremes of party were fully illustrated. To believe both—it was a struggle between "king-killers"² and parliament killers, and between the two, monarchy was in danger of extirpation, each discovering in the other only the means of its death. By one party the monarchy was to be ended by the removal of the king, and by the other by the removal of the parliament. The fundamental dif-

ever heard." * * "How differently did ministers feel on the code of liberty, and on the code of despotism! The Corresponding Societies came forward with spirit in the cause of parliamentary reform, and a few paltry libels were published; the Habeas Corpus was immediately suspended, indictments for high treason were drawn up, new treasons enacted, and the bill of rights repealed. A more atrocious libel than any that had been published had appeared from the pen of a ministerial hireling against the House of Commons, and the motion which was made was the orders of the day." Charles Grey, afterwards Earl Grey, said—"The author of this libel was entitled to candor and indulgence. It was only an historical fact for this discussion of antiquaries. Had it been stated, however, that democracy was the root, and monarchy only an excrescence, what would the Right Hon. gentleman have said? Would he not have pronounced it treason? Should we not have heard it was copying the French?"—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xxxii, p. 614.

¹ In the House of Commons, in the debate on "the Seditious Meetings Bill," *Sheridan* said, "If any orator, in the heat of his argument, should use a seditious word, or one which the magistrates construed to be so, and not immediately desist when desired so to do, the riot act was to be read, and followed up by military execution. Reformers in general were not very ready to attend to a gentle hint, and here there was but one alternative; for if the magistrate did not

find him passive and obedient, when setting him to rights, he was to knock him down. Besides, how many magistrates were to be employed to disperse a large assembly? He supposed they were to be procured by advertisement, and we might shortly expect to read in the public papers, "Wanted an immense number of magistrates, to prevent the dissemination of seditious doctrines, and set the people to rights."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xxxii, p. 296.

² Mr. Canning was of opinion, that there was an intimate connection between the proceedings at Copenhagen House, and the disgraceful outrage which followed. An attempt had been made against the King, and a hand-bill was circulated on the practice of "King-Killing."—*P. D.*, Vol. xxxii, p. 301. "There might, indeed," said *Sheridan*, "be hand-bills written and distributed, and most probably were, as others had been before them, by spies and informers. He was warranted in saying this, for practices of this sort had been proved. Ministers had propagated such libels frequently through the medium of their scandalous and disgraceful tools." Mr. Grey said, "he did not believe that the insult to his majesty originated at Copenhagen House. It was said that the doctrine of King-Killing was preached there. He knew nothing of that." Mr. Duncombe said, "he wished to see the kingly part of the constitution protected, but there was another part of it that deserved no less attention, namely, the democratical."—*P. D.*, Vol. xxxii, p. 303.

ference between the two was,—that while truth was vital to the strength and life of the one, error was equally important to the other.

Thus the monarchy of England has been defended as a system of despotism and by a party vote. The extreme question was distinctly propounded and discussed by John Reeves, and though his opinions were not openly accepted they were virtually endorsed by a tory parliament. The Sedition and Treason bills were passed during the same session and by large majorities. The debates on these questions are particularly alluded to in this connection because they forcibly illustrate the extremes of party under a constitutional government even when not threatened by revolution. The reader will find democracy ably defended, under a monarchy, in the speeches of Chas. James Fox, Sheridan, Erskine, Grey, Whitebread and others, in the Commons ; and of the Dukes of Bedford and Leeds, the Earls of Lauderdale and Abingdon, and others—in the House of Lords. Of course, the claims of monarchy cannot be well discussed without a comparison with republicanism.

REPUBLICANISM.

The word *republic*—is from the Latin, *res*, and *republica*, and in its true definition should be used to embrace not only the public affairs of a country but whatever contributes to the public good, truly interprets the public voice, or faithfully executes the public will. This form of government is of democratic origin. Its provisions enable the people to act. As monarchy is the rule of a single person, so a republic is the rule of more than one. The word is not significant of principle except as to universality of interest and number,—and the principle is to be found in that definition which comprehends democracy in its highest sense. A commonwealth, in name, may be a tyranny in practice, but it would be false to its professed standard,—the common-weal. A monarchy, limited by a constitution, may be denominated a republic, and a republic may be found in an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy. It has its range on the scale of number, from one to the few, an oligarchy ; from the few to the many, or all,—a democracy ; and on the scale of quality, the best, an aristocracy.¹

It is a word of indefinite meaning, and it has been made so by its abuse, or misapplication.² And yet, if used with strict reference to its etymology

¹ *Polybius* says,—“ All aristocracies and democracies terminate at last in Monarchy.” This is in contradiction to the universality of God’s Providence. Great and ultimate truths are only to be found in a diverging progress,—from the one to the many, from the nation to the universe.

² *Burke* says,—“ If he had any merit at all, it was that of having read industriously and attentively : and of course the origin and composition of republics had not escaped him. It was observed that all dogs went by the same name, though no species of animal contained a greater diversity. Thus it might be said of republics. Those

and implied meaning,—there cannot be a republic without a democracy. As a republic is the frame work upon which a democracy must act, so democracy represents the principle without which a republic is a mere mockery. The one is the body with its members, the other is the soul which gives life to function, and will to mind. When numbers and general interests are referred to, as when we use the word republic, we commit ourselves to the full definition in its highest sense, and it is a practical recognition of the principle which comprehends democracy,—the general welfare of the people. Despotism, oligarchy, aristocracy, tyranny, are terms representing the abuse of power without regard to form of government.

A nation is a combined system of public action, where the general good is paramount to special interests, and, like other systems, is dependent upon its own peculiar means of self-protection and outward advancement. As it is made up of multitudes of intelligent beings, of varying races, grades, and conditions of men, the mode of practical development and co-operation often becomes complicated, and duty a difficult problem. The subdivisions of society are seen to be an obvious necessity. In no other way can human agency be made available; and hence the variety of modifications to be found under different and under the same forms of government. Self-government is the highest form. "It was to obtain and preserve this inestimable blessing that the good and great have struggled with every form of opposition in every age of the world."² Its very terms assert the highest duty and responsibility. They not only imply the necessity of self-knowledge and a capacity of self-control, but a comprehensive knowledge of wants and the best means of supplying them. It claims the highest condition of aggregated ability, and the sources of control in all its parts, separately and together. Every man, family, town, county, state, and section becomes a part. Every class, whether as a race

of Holland, Venice, Genoa, etc., differ widely in their governments, yet they were such as ambassadors might be sent to; for they were not regicidal republics, nor republics of confraternity with the seditious and disaffected in every state."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xxx, p. 59.

¹ Jefferson defines a republic to be strictly "a government by its citizens in mass, acting directly and personally, according to rules established by the majority; and that every other government is more or less republican, in proportion as it has in its composition, more or less of this ingredient of the direct action of its citizens. Such a government is evidently restrained to very

narrow limits of space and population, and is perhaps not practicable beyond the extent of a New England township. The first shade from this pure element, which, like pure vital air, cannot sustain life of itself, would be where the powers of the government, being divided, should be exercised each by representatives chosen by the citizens, either *pro hoc vice*, or for such short terms as should render secure the duty of expressing the will of their constituents. This I should consider as the nearest approach to a pure republic which is practicable, on a large scale of country or population."—*Tucker's Jefferson*, Vol. II, p. 371.

² Peter Cooper.

or representing a particular cause, or interest, becomes a part; and it is to the conflicts of these parts that we are to look for the developments of principle and for the means of adjusting differences. It is the legitimate function of each part first to assert itself, itself only, and then to pass to the next and higher process of action and duty—that of combination, or union of parts. Upon this principle the republic is based; and, as its great power and strength come from its subdivisions of territory, population, interests, and duties, the nicest system of adjustment becomes of vital importance. Neglect of any part to itself, or of any parts to one another; any permitted inequality, any injustice whatever, whether directly designed or indirectly permitted, would not only introduce elements of discord and cause positive derangement, but render national unity utterly impossible. “As in organic beings,” says Niebuhr, “the most perfect life is that which animates the greatest variety of members, so, among states, that is the most perfect in which a number of institutions, originally distinct, being organized each after its kind into centres of national life, form a complete whole.”

This subject is entitled to serious consideration. Republicanism, to be sustained, must be thoroughly understood. It is the only system of government in which the power of control and the consent of the governed, are alike based upon knowledge. Ignorant, or passive consent may be as fatal to constitutional authority as its wilful perversion. Republican government is self-existent only on the principle of mutuality,—embracing discernment of system and sense of duty,—both in the magistrate and in the citizen.

Monarchy is self-reliant, and it does not wholly depend upon the condition of its subjects for success. Its reality is the will of one. If it defers to others, it is concession, or to ask for counsel and aid. Its want of self-confidence is often its greatest wisdom. Republicanism is a system of self-government created by the people with a conscious knowledge of its wants and provisions, its designs and ends. Its reality is practice, and its wisdom is derived from a discriminating experience. Its want of self-confidence implies either ignorance or folly.

Ancient republics failed, not because the principles of democracy lost their vitality and ceased to exist, but because society was in a consolidated condition. They died from lack of principle, or of congestion. They were theories without the means of practice, systems without the means of action. Power cannot be exercised without subdivision of means. The mind has its various faculties, and each faculty has its means of manifestation, and all are governed by unalterable laws of unity. The human body has its numerous members,¹ and each member its special function, but

¹This truth cannot be too much elaborated. The human body consists of—two hundred and forty bones, nine kinds of articulations or joinings, one hundred cartilages and ligaments, four hundred muscles and tendons; one hundred nerves; besides

without completeness of parts and independence of function—the animal economy would cease. So of a republic,—made up of separate states. Each state must have a distinct organization and growth, a defined sphere of action, and within that sphere enjoy all the prerogatives of sovereignty necessary to its independence as a state. Without such independence a state would not be prepared to make a part of a republic.¹ It would be no part. A nominal part of a whole is an absurdity. A perfect whole cannot be made of incomplete parts.

The government of Mexico is called a republic,—but it is a mere nominal distinction, for whatever form of government they have adopted in that unfortunate country,—the government itself has been practically the same. The progressive and conservative growth of France, has touched the two extremes in the scale of civilization, and this process will continue for generations to come. France is not yet prepared to become a republic permanently. Its government is too much centred in Paris. Until France divides her territory, and gives and secures sectional interests, and sectional independence—she will not have a foundation upon which to base a republic. England, after the Heptarchy, was not in a condition to be a republic. The power of a people must be placed under conditions of intelligence before it can be combined for federal action. When Scotland, Ireland and Wales were united with England, the preliminary formation necessary to a republic, was commenced, and when the people of these sections, and in the British Colonies, are in an equal condition with that of England, and stand upon a common level as to education, knowledge, dignity, industry and law—then Great Britain may become a republic.

That the colonists were democrats, even under a monarchy, and that they clearly saw at an early period that the republican form of government was the only one that would give life and actuality to democratic principles, there can be no doubt. The provisions of their charters, their laws and institutions, their colonial boundaries and organizations, their declared views of government, and even their jealousies and prejudices,—all dis-

blood, arteries, veins, glands, stomach, intestines, lungs, heart, liver, kidneys, lymphatics, lacteals, and three skins, the epidermis, the rete mucosura, and the true skin, beneath which is the tela cellulosa, distributed through the system and surrounding every muscle and fibre, every artery, vein, nerve, and lymphatic.

¹ In a letter to Samuel Adams, Nov. 20, 1790, John Adams says,—“It is a fixed principle that all good government is, and must be, republican.” In reply, Samuel

Adams says,—“You have my hearty concurrence; and I believe we are well enough acquainted with each other’s ideas, to understand what we respectively mean when we “use the word with approbation.”—Life of Samuel Adams, Vol. III, p. 810. In another letter to John Adams, he says,—“When this millenium shall commence, if there shall be any need of civil government, indulge me in the fancy that it will be in the republican form, or something better.”—*Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 802.

covered not only a republican spirit, but a democratic practice. There was no serious obstacle interposed either by the Crown or the Parliament to check such views or such a course. So long as royalty was indulged as a patron, and commerce was too small to yield a revenue,—there was no conflict of prerogatives, no collision of schemes. They were loyal to the king, and they had been taught to love their country. They were proud of its strength and achievements, and were ever ready to contribute to its glory. They had helped to fight its battles, and they claimed to be a part of the British Army and Navy. Still, it cannot be doubted, that a large majority of the colonists were republicans. Why should it be otherwise? They had long been permitted to administer the government on republican principles, and this was demanded by their condition. A few prominent men, mostly officials, were bold to denounce republicanism as the great source of all mischief, the greatest of sins, as rank disloyalty and treason,—but they were powerless to influence the mass of the people. They saw the source of power only in their commissions from the hands of royalty; they could understand no influence but that which was based upon titles and distinctions, and they could understand no government except on the principle of coercion. They had been blinded by the delusive error, which has so long enfeebled humanity, and blackened the pages of history,—that national glory is only associated with military rule.

The people, however, had long enjoyed a democratic government, republican in form, and it was a species of revolution to propose to interfere either with the principle, or the means of its manifestation. They were content to be let alone, and they had no desire to disturb the British monarchy, which, so far as they were concerned, had always permitted a republican form of government. Its establishment had been authorized by the British Constitution. Republicanism in America had not been a party question. Democracy discovered no factious party spirit in asserting its rights. Its purposes were those of imperative duty, its claims were scrupulously measured, and deferentially loyal. England saw no safety but in a monarchy, America saw no peace but in a republic. The power of royalty combined with a Tory parliament to separate and destroy what had been ordained by Providence to be strengthened and forever united. Each colony had organized its own government, enacted its own laws, and formed its own character. What had been necessary in perfecting the parts now became a question involving the whole.¹ Combination for defence had become a necessity,—not for the compromise of rights, but for the division of duties. Not for creating a rival power, but for excluding

¹ This separate independence of the colonies was a fact admitted at an early period. In 1754, in the debate on the question of extending the Mutiny Bill to America, in the Commons, Mr. Robert Viner said,—“I must think, *that as our colonies are inde-*

rivalry from equal and independent states that were to be united for specific purposes. Not for aiding a monarchy, but to establish a republic.

The American people were prepared for such a crisis. They were intelligent, prudent, brave and well informed. They had had five generations of experience, and they had not been indifferent to the teachings of history. They had done every thing to make a republic easy, and monarchy had done nothing to render it difficult. The people were chiefly democrats, and republicanism was their only mode of action. No other mode was possible in view of public opinion, no other mode was efficient in view of the public wants. The colonists deplored rebellion, but they did not fear it. They abhorred disloyalty,—but they saw no good reason why a king should be exempted from its penalties, or a parliament from its stigma.

Thus the American republic had its origin in the condition of things on the American Continent, in the condition of the American people, in their judgment and intelligence, in their institutions and character, in their rights and wants as citizens and men, in their claims and duties as Christians and Americans, in their colonial organizations and state independence, and not in any preconceived theory of man or of party. The republic was a representative government, both in principle and of trust. Of principle inherent in democracy, and of trust—in faithfulness to delegated authority. It was a representative republic in the sense embracing the capacity to discern and comprehend the rights and needs of a free people, and the requisite will and power to defend and supply them. The voice of democracy had its home in every colony, and every colony, in assuming the weighty responsibilities of state,—as distinctly asserted its reserved prerogatives as it declared the limits of its delegated trusts. This was the republicanism of the American revolution of 1776.

POLITICAL PERIODS OF ENGLAND, PRECEDING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The teachings of history are often limited within periods too brief to be profitable. A generation, or a century is marked to be studied merely because it is a round period of time convenient to be written, or spoken,—but with no particular reference to men, or society. Progress cannot be seen in short intervals, nor can its philosophy be comprehended unless events are studied in their natural or causative connections. To a certain extent this is necessary, that the motives of public men, who have closed

pendent of one another, and consequently cannot agree upon any general law for the regulation of an army that is to be raised by all of them together: I say, I must for this reason think, that some new law ought to be passed by the British legislature, for the regulation of their troops, when acting either by themselves, or in conjunction with the British troops, etc., etc."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xv, p. 379.

their career of duty, may be explained by themselves, or by their friends. Individuals, who have taken a part in the affairs of a nation have imputed motives to explain, and expressed opinions to defend—which time alone can develop, and which need reflective study and revision. This must be done by themselves to be done correctly, when retired from active duty, or by friends whose confidence they have commanded, or whose sympathies they have enjoyed.

With parties, such a course is still more important. Every party claims to have a principle and a policy, and these are constantly subjected either to the misapprehensions of honest men, or to misrepresentations of dishonest opponents. Men who seek or accept public office, virtually consent to a public record, and that record belongs to the world. It is a record of precedent to be avoided, or of example to be followed. The experience of the past is a continuous legacy to the present, and its legitimate use secures the requisite safeguards for the future. Nations are not to be studied separately, but together. There is a society of nations, as well as of men, and its customs and laws indicate the civilization of the world. Wise legislation is a process of cause and effect when viewed in its results upon society, and when advanced by comprehensive diplomacy, it embraces the welfare of the great family of man to be found in the grand subdivisions of nationality. Democracy represents a principle of duty, of condition, and when realized it becomes a privilege, a visible blessing. These are truths as much in Austria, Prussia, Spain and Russia, as in America. Because democracy does not prevail every where alike, it is not safe to infer its absence, or to deny its existence. Like Christianity, it is independent of conditions. Its existence does not depend upon royalty, nor upon the faith of skeptics. What democracy was in England two hundred years ago, is democracy in America to-day. The lessons of the past should serve to establish principles of duty in the present. It is not to be found only here or only there, but everywhere. It is the monarch's secret of success, the subject's source of prosperity. It is the rich man's guide, the poor man's guardian. Without democracy the statesman fails in his measures, and the government in its ends. It appeals to the noblest sentiments of the soul, and unites a Christian temper with the sternest spirit of patriotic duty. A kingdom cannot prosper without it, and without it a republic is impossible. It has been the glory of England, it is to be the glory of America. It is to be the glory of the world.

To have a clear and distinct view of the American Revolution, as an event of progress, it cannot be otherwise than profitable to take a brief survey of the times from the Commonwealth of Cromwell to the reign of George III. The Commonwealth of Cromwell to the reign of George III., and a discriminating view of the character of the sovereigns of England during that period, particularly of George the Third, who favored the war against

the American Colonies, form important chapters in history. If the Colonies were clearly right in their rebellion, England was clearly wrong in the war. If the Colonies were true to the British Constitution, the king and his ministers, and the majority of Parliament were unjust and disloyal. Who were the offenders, and what was the measure of their capacity, their knowledge, their integrity, their patriotism,—or the measure of their ignorance, pride, incapacity, selfishness, or stupidity? Did the king mislead? What were his motives, and what his antecedents and character? Were his ministers incapable or dishonest? What bias, or circumstances led them to be so? Did Parliament in its party zeal influence the Crown and its advisers to a policy so fatal to the great interests of the nation, so mortifying to its pride? These are questions to be asked and answered by the student of history if he desires fully to comprehend the mistakes, either of men or of party, or the near or remote causes of the American Revolution. He would naturally desire to know whether an able and accomplished king, or statesman, was a safer head to a government, than an ignorant man without experience or capacity. Or, whether a ruler of doubtful integrity is more likely to be loyal, than an honest man. No one would be surprised to hear a plain democratic republican ask, even in these days, “Who was George the Third, who had the will, but not the power, to enslave America? Who were his ancestors, and what their origin, training, and education, that their descendants should presume to claim for the Crown a power of control on the Continent of America, not recognized by the British Constitution? What sprig of royalty was it, saved by the merest accident, or chance freak of pride or passion, or produced by debauchery, or by the stupidity of party,—that commenced the lineage that now honors the throne of England?” The reader is amply compensated by turning to the pages of history to find answers to these questions.

Such questions cannot always be answered by language, but by events. They require to be studied. Special information detailed by the historian affords only the materials for the student, and these materials are to be classified in due order of significance that principles may be discovered. There can be no answer to such questions but in the mastery of knowledge which comprehends not only the brief dynasties of men, but the long struggles of nations, the undeviating rule of Providence. One man cannot answer for another. Each must answer for himself. No one can answer for himself, even, unless he is able to discern the near and distant significance of events; to understand the motives and passions of men in their individual as well as in their conventional relations. As self-knowledge is the first, so a knowledge of society may be defined as the second, duty of man. The lives of men are divided, by biographers, into periods as to time, and subdivided in application as to duty. Each period has its lessons, and each period has its duties, and as is the observance of the former, and

the application of the latter,—so is the aggregate of the character of the man. From the general result—his influence is estimated upon society and the world. So of nations. They have experience, an experience which is conventional. They have their periods of youth, manhood and old age; their periods of folly and wisdom, of error and shame, of strength and weakness, of success and failure. To understand these periods, and to connect them, it is necessary to comprehend their meaning as taught by the philosophy of cause and effect. Without faith in progress, existence is nothing. Without confidence in duty, man is a being without motive, and nations can have no mission. It follows then, that life is to be studied for the benefit of life, and whether men have their way, or are baffled in their purposes, it is alike their duty to turn with reverence upon the teachings of the past, that its errors may be avoided and the future improved. Men can accomplish nothing unless they are established in the belief of something, and whatever is their standard of belief, their knowledge of principles, and their faithful application of them to duty, so will be the practical results of their lives and labors. Men cannot believe in progress until they are able to see it, and it is quite certain that they cannot understand it unless they confidently mark the teachings of history upon the extended scale of Providence, in time, which is but an infinitesimal part of the incomprehensible scale of eternity.

It has been seen that the experience of England has been embodied in her Constitution. This makes up her chapter of political wisdom. On the one hand is to be seen, truth, duty and success; and on the other, error, failure and disgrace. But in looking to the general results, whether of success to the nation, or of progress to the world, it will be clearly seen how insignificant is the wisdom of man, when compared to the over ruling Providence of God. Men of patriotism have been immortalized by their noble thoughts and deeds, while others have been denounced for their infamy by each succeeding generation, though their perfidy like that of Judas has been made a subordinating instrument to bless the world. Joseph was sold by his brethren, from evil motives, but God made him an instrument of great good, though sold as a slave. He stands as an enduring example of duty; his brethren of crime. This view does not warrant the inference that man's accountability is lessened, because his crimes are made to advance the glory of God, but rather increased, by the knowledge that success and happiness can only be secured by the strict observance of duty. The rock is no less a danger—because its existence affords a foundation for a beacon light—to turn mariners from destruction. Its elements of danger are converted into means of safety.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF CROMWELL.

The reign of Charles the First, and the Commonwealth of Cromwell, have

been briefly noticed in a previous chapter. From this period let the reader study the great events of England to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,—and although this work can do but little more than indicate an imperfect method of analysis, he may be enabled to increase the value of its hints and suggestions by his own researches and reflections.

When Cromwell became a revolutionist he was more influenced by his faith in his ability to correct the errors of monarchy, than by any knowledge which he possessed of means to establish a democratic republican government. The republican theory to him, as to all others, doubtless was beautiful, because it was democratic. This great fact inspired him with courage to attempt an experiment, which if it needed any apology would find it in his motives to extend freedom, rather than in his knowledge either of himself, or of agents to be employed, to discover means to perpetuate and administer the government. “He had no friends but his agents,” is a remark of Guizot. He was not to be influenced by “flesh and blood,”¹ when he felt himself impelled by the voice of God. His position was fully understood by Lord Capell who was ready to make any sacrifice to serve the king. On the 15th of January, 1649, he wrote to Cromwell, from his cell in the Tower—with the enthusiasm of a high-minded gentleman, conjuring him to save the King. The following passage is full of meaning: “But my present condition refuseth me the ability of anything else but that of invoking the favor of God for him, and making my addresses to you, whom I take to be the figure that gives the denomination to the sequence of *a great many ciphers that follow you.*” Self-confidence is limited by individual capacity, and when Cromwell assumed the high office of Protector,—he permitted himself to be placed in a position of dependence upon others, when he was surrounded by men, and nations, not in harmony with himself, as to knowledge and sympathy.² When he realized the crushing realities of government, and the delusive difficulties of controlling the will of others as he controlled his own; when his self-reliance was undermined by the deceptive weaknesses of his own aims, and by the servility of ignorant and irresponsible dependents,—he was led to conclude that the theory of republicanism was

¹ After Cromwell had taken possession of the Parliament house, and closed it he returned to Whitehall, where he found several of his officers. He told them what he had done. “When I went there,” he said, “I did not think to have done this. But perceiving the Spirit of God so strong upon me, I would not consult flesh and blood.”—*Guizot's Cromwell*, Vol., I. p. 818.

² Macanlay says,—“Oliver, indeed, was little disposed to be either a persecutor or a

meddler; but Oliver, the head of a party, and consequently, to a great extent, the slave of a party, could not govern altogether according to his own inclinations.”—*Hist. Eng.* Vol. I, p. 152. It would be difficult to prove that Cromwell was not both, “a persecutor and a meddler.” As neither character can be justified in a republican, the plea of military necessity cannot avail him.

a safe one—provided it could be carried out by a monarchy—under another name.¹ This was an absurdity. He was no less a monarch because he was called a Protector.² The new title was popular, it was promising to the people, it was democratic. But was it redeemed? Where does history recite a more revolting tyranny than that to be found in his policy towards Ireland?³ Even if it was redeemed by him, was it redeemed by his son? Was his experiment a success? In his republicanism he was led to adopt the peculiar weakness of monarchy, its hereditary liabilities, without sufficiently divesting himself of his natural selfishness to avail himself of the peculiar strength of democracy. If he reformed the representative system in constituting a new House of Commons,—there was but little merit in it because he permitted no continued life or freedom to the

¹ Voltaire says,—“Cromwell, an usurper, worthy of a throne, had assumed the title of protector, not that of king; because the English knew how far the regal prerogatives ought to extend, but were not acquainted with the limits of the protectorial authority.” He was called, not His Majesty, but His Highness. The army detested the name of King.—See *Milloy's Hist.*, VOL. v, p. 160.

² Among Cromwell's papers, proofs were found of his dealings with the Cavaliers, and some lines against the Protector, written in his own hand:—

“A Protector! what's that? 'Tis a stately thing,
That confesseth itself but the ape of a king;
A counterfeit-piece, that woodenly shows
A golden effigy, with a copper nose.
In face, he is one, we may Protector call,
From whom the King of Kings protect us all.”

—*Old Parl. Hist.* VOL. XX, pp. 481, 482.
Guizot's Cromwell, VOL. II, p. 129.

³ The Scotch and English having rebelled against the King in 1639 (for the march of the Scottish rebels to the Border in that year was on the invitation of the leaders of the popular party in England, though they themselves did not openly take the field till 1642), the Irish rose in his favor. They were finally subdued, in 1652, by Cromwell and the arms of the Commonwealth; and then took place a scene not witnessed in Europe since the conquest of Spain by the Vandals. Indeed, it is in justice to the Vandals to equal them with the English of

1652; for the Vandals came as strangers and conquerors in an age of force and barbarism, nor did they banish the people, though they seized and divided their lands by lot; but the English in 1652, were of the same nation as half of the chief families in Ireland, and had at that time had the island under their sway for five hundred years.

“The captains and men of war of the Irish, amounting to 40,000 men and upwards, they banished into Spain, where they took service under that King; others of them, with a crowd of orphan boys and girls, were transported to serve the English planters in the West Indies; and the remnant of the nation, not banished or transported, were to be transplanted into Connought, while the conquering army divided the ancient inheritances of the Irish amongst them by lot.”—*Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*, by John P. Pendergast, Esq., Preface p. xi. See “*Britannic Constitution*,” by Roger Acherly, Esq. Also, Robertson's *History of the Emperor Charles V.*, Appendix to Introduction.

Daniel O'Connell says,—“When the war had ceased, Cromwell collected, as the first fruits of peace, 80,000 Irish in the southern parts of Ireland, to transplant them to the West India Islands. As many as survived the process of collection were embarked in transports for these islands. Of the 80,000, in six years, the survivors did not amount to twenty individuals!”—*O'Connell's Memoir of Ireland*, p. 7.

body. His attempt to organize a House of Lords was ludicrously inconsistent.¹ If he bestowed new liberties upon the nation, he as clearly infringed old ones which had been enjoyed by the people through time immemorial.² He wished to believe that monarchy was dead, and the proclamation was made to this effect by his followers, and yet, in principle he recognized not only a monarch in himself, but was willing to impose a successor upon the people. This was dishonest. As a representative man he was false to his own standard. As a subject, he placed himself upon the record as a traitor. The good he accomplished has served to extenuate his crimes, but not to confirm the safety of his examples. He was false to his own theory, false to his own professions, and he furnished another example of human frailty mistaking the qualifications of vanity for the means of strength. He seized distinction as if it were a power. He sought to ally himself with the nobility that the ancient families of the kingdom might be restored to power, and in connection with his own name. He seemed to forget that his usurpation³ had its origin in coercion, and his success was acquired, and his rule continued only by means of military power. He displaced men when he could not command their confidence, and parliaments when they failed to heed his unconditional requisitions. What he failed to accomplish at home, he endeavored to make up by imposing alliances abroad. What he could not do by peaceful means he was ever ready to do by war. He believed in force, when he commanded it, but he feared conspiracies and insurrections. when others questioned his policy, or opposed his measures. Surrounded by royalists who hated him, and by influential

¹ "This was the least happy of his contrivances," says Macaulay, "and displeased all parties. The Levellers were angry with him for instituting a privileged class. The multitude, which felt respect and fondness for the great historical names of the land, laughed without restraint at a House of Lords in which lucky draymen and shoemakers were seated, to which few of the old nobles were invited, and from which almost all of those old nobles who were invited turned disdainfully away."—*Hist. Eng.* Vol. 1, p. 127.

² Hume's *Hist. Eng.*, Vol. v, p. 421.

³ Prof. J. D. Knowles, in his "Memoir of Roger Williams," (pp. 800, 801) says,—"It is surprising to hear, from American writers, reproaches against Cromwell as a usurper. They show the effect of a discreditable deference to foreign writers. But all American

authors are not disposed to echo the infidel and tory opinions of England." He speaks of Dr. Stiles, in his *History of the Judges*, and of a writer in the *Christian Spectator*, for Sept. 1829, as creditable exceptions. He also refers to the famous line of Pope,—

"See Cromwell damned to everlasting fame,"

as aiding to confirm "the prejudice against Cromwell."

The historian has no choice but to employ language legitimately. Democracy has no defence but in truth. It is not *prejudice* to speak of a fact as it is, nor is it calumny to draw the line of distinction between right and wrong—in the acts of the same individual. Arguments may explain facts, but they can neither modify nor annihilate them. Facts are independent of all theories and parties.

friends who doubted him, his administration was one of constant difficulty and embarrassment. His military enterprises, and secret agents loaded him with anxiety and debt, and whatever troubled him gave confidence to his enemies. His early familiarities with the officers and soldiers of the army were deemed to be inconsistent with his dignity when he became Lord Protector, and his discontinuance of such attentions tended to change the likes of companionship into jealousy and disgust. He was in constant fear of assassination,¹ and not without good reasons, for while he claimed credit for some good things, no one was more conscious than himself of what he had done to create an atmosphere of violence. Without influential friends to whom he could look for disinterested counsel, and without the sympathies even of his own family, he became perplexed and impatient, and he was prepared for any measures, however reckless, provided they increased his safety, and lessened his dangers. He feared danger from every person and every movement, and he heavily armed himself, and was surrounded by a strong body guard when exposed to surprise or attack. He was loud in his profession of principle, and of his devotion to duty, but he appeared to be ignorant of the fact—that the rule of democracy has no occasion for a standing army in time of peace, nor special pride in a leader, who, however skilful as a commander, had not the courage to heed the warning voice of the Decalogue,² or to practise the simple rules of plain and honest duty.³

¹ The consciousness of this position, which daily impressed itself more strongly on his mind, led him to adopt incessant and most vigilant precautions for his own safety; he wore a steel shirt under his clothes; whenever he went out his carriage was filled with attendants, a numerous escort accompanied him, and he proceeded at full speed, "frequently diverging from the road to the right or left, and generally returning by a different route." In his residence at Whitehall, he reserved several bed-chambers to his own use, each of which was provided with a secret door. He had chosen men for a constant body guard.—*Guizot's Cromwell*, Vol. II, p. 329.

² His wife, Elizabeth Bourchier, who, though he lived on good terms with her, furnished her more than once with just cause for complaint. Lady Dysart, who afterwards became Duchess of Lauderdale, Lady Lambert, and perhaps others, whose names are not certainly known, had been, or still were,

on terms of intimacy with Cromwell, which, though carefully kept secret, had not completely escaped detection: he is said to have had several natural children.—*Guizot's Cromwell*, Vol. II, 343.

³ From his apartments in the Cockpit he had removed with his family to those which in former times had been appropriated to the king; they were newly furnished in the most costly and magnificent style; and in the banqueting-room was placed a chair of state on a platform, raised by three steps above the floor. Here the Protector stood to receive the ambassadors. They were instructed to make three reverences, one at the entrance, the second in the midway, and the third at the lower step, to each of which Cromwell answered by a slight inclination of the head. When they had delivered their speeches, and received the reply of the Protector, the same ceremonial was repeated at their departure.—*Dr. Lingard's Hist. Eng.*, Vol. VIII, p. 211.

A home government, like that of the family, becomes a tyranny unless it be based upon the consent and affections of the governed, and upon the right of resistance against the unwarrantable subversions of constitutional safe-guards. Sole confidence in the military power implies sad ignorance of the sublime attributes of Deity. In addition to political cabals he found military cabals quite as dangerous to meet, and more difficult to master. Praying soldiers, and self confident fanatics acquire an independence of opinion incompatible with wise subordination. They are taught self reliance, not in view of experience or of capacity, but of conceit and passion. Self is supreme as to power and wisdom, and considerate counsel is heresy. An unwise resort to arms increases the difficulty sought to be remedied, and every succeeding step of such a policy serves to multiply evils which force may continue, but which force cannot end. This truth was demonstrated by Cromwell, not by his successes, but failures. His confidence in coercion enabled him to control men, whether in parliament or in the army, and such a practice was in violation of democracy. The power of principle, the laws of right and of progress—have an inherent force superior to that of art, and beyond the visions of human capacity. When men are opposed by obstacles of their own creation, and imagine that their reverses are but the tests of Providence, and that they have become the chosen ministers of God—their frenzy increases in proportion to the extent of their disappointments. A fanatic never doubts himself. He literally adopts the teachings of Scripture—"He that doubteth is damned." Human capacity is at a great discount when God is claimed as a partisan, and great defeats are viewed as preparations for great reforms. Cromwell's prayers, and special Fasts were almost invariably followed by acts of increased violence and outrage. He could discover the hand of God in a floating cloud,¹ concurrent with his own devices,—but he failed to see it in an obstacle to his will,—even though at the sacrifice of peace and life. As his confidence was increased in himself, it was lessened in others. His convictions of safety within the means of his own control are not to be classed with those of honest duty, but with those of apprehended danger, where he sees no choice, and makes the plea of necessity. Thus power becomes centralized by the process of doubt. Friends are doubted, wise and honest men are doubted, councils are doubted, parliaments are doubted, kings are doubted,—and even God himself is doubted—if Providence does not promptly meet the exigencies

¹ In speaking of the harassing attacks of not the Lord, by his Providence, put a Gen. Lesley, Commander of the Army in cloud over the moon, thereby giving us an Scotland, Cromwell says,—“One of these opportunity to draw off those horse to the attacks during the night, was so vigorous, rest of our army.”—*Guizot's Cromwell*, VOL. I, p. 139. that our rear brigade of horse, had like to have engaged with their whole army, had

of fanaticism. He was not inspired by the confiding spirit of the pious Ezra to confess his shame in asking for a body-guard when in the special service of his God.¹ The nature and extent of his faith may be seen in the fact that he "termed his guns his twelve apostles."

That Cromwell did not strictly trust in God—may be seen by his numerous measures intended to centre supreme control in himself. He spent large sums in secret service;² he doubted his ministers by restrictive instructions; he doubted his generals and his soldiers, because they did not always respect his will, and he gave them but little discretionary power; he doubted jury trials because their verdicts did not always harmonize with his avowed purposes; he doubted the freedom of the press, without a censorship;³ he doubted democracy, for while he claimed to honor the Parliament above royalty, he exceeded constitutional royalty by controlling the Parliament. While he adopted the theory of levelling what he called the inequalities of society, but which were only its higher and lower conditions, he organized a despotism. Not that he might secure to the people a democratic government, but that he might signalize himself as a despot. He claimed to have a plan of government, in accordance with his professions of principle, but his practice was subversive of his theory, and to his dismay he was compelled by slow and painful degrees to reap the fruits of his perfidy. If he did not have the audacity to supplant his own Commonwealth, he did not hold himself guiltless of the presumption of claiming a kindred successor, nor of advancing his family to places of trust and distinction. His want of ultimate success was not attributable to democracy, but to the absence of it. His apparent piety and integrity, his professed devotion to freedom and equality, his native vigor and

¹ Ezra, Ch. viii, 22.

² Cromwell believed in secrecy in conducting public affairs, and he seemed to enjoy the peculiar duties of such a policy. In 1654, Parliament placed at his disposal two fleets of three thousand soldiers. He merely stated that their duty would be to establish the maritime predominance of England in all seas. One day, a mob of the wives of the sailors who were serving on board, pursued him through the streets, inquiring whither their husbands were to be sent. Cromwell replied with a smile: "The ambassadors of France and Spain would each of them willingly give me a million to know that."—*Guizot's Cromwell*, Vol. II, p. 173. On another occasion one of his fanatics approached him "in the name of the

Lord and demanded to know the destination of one of his fleets." Cromwell replied, "My good friend, the Lord shall know, for thou shalt go with the fleet." He immediately gave orders for having him stowed in one the vessels then under sailing orders; and sent him out, thus confined, with the expedition. This was both a rebuke and a confession.

³ In 1658 the number of weekly newspapers was twelve. This number after the Protectorate was reduced to eight. An order of Council, dated Sept. 5, 1655, prohibited the future publication of any paper without the special and continued sanction of the Secretary of State.—*Goodwin's Hist. of the Commonwealth*, Vol. IV, p. 225.

skilful judgment, his displays of promised advantage and public triumphs, inspired the people with new hopes and energies, and led them to imagine that new sources of enterprise had been opened to the country, and that by the blessing of God, they were to enjoy the immunities of freedom, and increased fruits of their own industry. But such visions of hope and expectation were not to be realized. The earliest friends of Cromwell were among the first to manifest an impatience with the results of their collective blunders, and to pray for a return "to the good old cause." This was equivalent to asking for a repetition of all their trials and misfortunes. The parliament they had, was not the parliament they wanted. They did not want a parliament for its counsels and wisdom, but for its subserviency. They did not trust the people without an attested assurance of their loyalty. Not loyalty to the Constitution, but to the party. Their party had become the government. It was a novel suggestion that the "Long Parliament" which had been expelled by the Protector, might be revived at will to serve their purposes. This was demanding life from death. This course was adopted, but with all the mean precautions of a narrow partisanship, and with all the cowardly expedients calculated to excite the contempt and disgust both of the army and of the people. As every measure of the struggling Commonwealth was a forward one, and no step backward, new follies were added to the follies of the past—until the Republican party perished from political congestion.

A party that is false to its trusts, is incapable of devising means to save itself. The Republican party of Cromwell divided and subdivided into factions, and as he had failed to develop a plan for their adoption, or to give them a practical knowledge of democracy,—they were all left to the uncertainties of anarchy, and to the misgivings of conscience unaided by knowledge. If Cromwell did not leave a son capable of perpetuating his name and rule, he certainly had the negative merit of leaving one who had but little ambition to persist in continued revolution, or to engage in public affairs. If it was not his lot to have a general who could unite his army after his decease, defend republicanism, and complete his scheme of government,—it was his Providential fate to have one whose judgment and courage, whose prudence and foresight could put back the government to its constitutional foundations. The general that aided him to remove monarchy was fully prepared to return it. Monk was a willing and consummate general for the Commonwealth, and for the Kingdom "a miracle."¹ Richard Crom-

¹ The Speaker of the House of Commons, April 25th, 1660, was authorized to present thanks to Lord-General Monk, for "his eminent and unparalleled services done to these nations." He said,—“That he was commanded by his house to take notice of his eminent services, his wisdom being such, and God having so blessed him in his great affairs, that he hath made a conquest of those who are enemies and disaffected to

well, it may be said, left wide open the door of the Commonwealth, and though crowds of his followers were eager to enter to have part in moving its clumsy machinery, no one, save the old friend and chosen servant of his father, had the means to clear the way and take possession for the successor of Charles the First. Revolutionary hands became the means of Restoration. There was no bolder democratic republican than Sidney, but he was no revolutionist.

But this imperfect sketch of the Cromwellian period would be incomplete without the speech¹ of Sir Henry Vane,² delivered in 1659, against the succession of Richard Cromwell to the Protectorate.

"Mr. Speaker,"—said Sir Henry, "Among all the people of the universe, I know none who have shown so much zeal for the liberty of their country as the English at this time have done; they have by the help of divine Providence, overcome all obstacles, and have made themselves free. We have driven away the hereditary tyranny of the house of Stuart, at the expense of much blood and treasure, in hopes of enjoying hereditary liberty, after having shaken off the yoke of kingship; and there is not a man among us who could have imagined that any person would be so bold as to dare to attempt the ravishing from us that freedom which cost us so much blood, and so much labor. But so it happens. I know not by what misfortune, we are fallen into the error of those who poisoned the Emperor Titus to make room for Domitian; who made away Augustus that they might have Tiberius; and changed Claudius for Nero. I am sensible these examples are foreign from my subject, since the Romans in those days were buried in lewdness and luxury, whereas the people of England are now renowned all over the world for their great virtue and discipline; and yet,—suffer an idiot, without courage, without sense,—nay, without ambition,—to have dominion in a country of liberty! One could bear a little with Oliver Cromwell, though, contrary to his oath of fidelity to the Parliament, contrary to his duty to the public, contrary to the respect he

the government, happiness, and welfare of this church and state, without a bloody nose." * * * He closed by declaring, "so that God's raising him up, accompanying, blessing, and assisting him in his counsels, in such sort as to accomplish his work to that height, cannot be otherwise owned by those that look upon him, and his actions, than as a miracle."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. iv, p. 13.

¹ This speech is taken from the *Biographia Britannica*. One of Vane's biographers thus speaks of it:—"This impetuous

torrent, swept everything before it. Oratory, genius, and the spirit of liberty, never achieved a more complete triumph. It was signal and decisive, instantaneous and irresistible. It broke, and forever, the power of Richard and his party." After its delivery Richard never again appeared in public.

² Sir Henry Vane was born in Kent, England, in 1612; was the fourth Governor of the Colony of Massachusetts, in 1636; and was executed for high-treason on Tower Hill, in 1662.

owed to that venerable body from whom he received his authority, he usurped the Government. His merit was so extraordinary, that our judgments, our passions, might be blinded by it. He made his way to empire by the most illustrious actions; he had under his command an army that had made him a conqueror, and a People that had made him their General. But, as for Richard Cromwell, his son, who is he? what are his titles? We have seen that he had a sword by his side; but did he ever draw it? And, what is of more importance in this case, is *he* fit to get obedience from a mighty Nation, who could never make a footman obey him? Yet, we must recognize this man as our King, under the style of Protector!—a man without birth, without courage, without conduct! For my part, I declare, Sir, it shall never be said that I made such a man my master!”

So far as Cromwell was true to Democracy he was successful. So far as he brought into activity new and faithful men, and rebuked and dismissed incapable and unfaithful servants, he was useful,—but democracy is in no way responsible either for his sins or his blunders.¹ He was indebted to his military power for his position, and such power in time of peace is destructive of all civil government whether it be in the hands of a King, or a Republican. It is against democracy and cannot stand. But, should monarchists congratulate themselves on the Restoration, and regard it as a triumph of their form of government—they are to be reminded that before and after the Commonwealth, royalty was subjected to three failures, in the reigns of Charles the First, Charles the Second, and James the Second. The fact that the Restoration was accomplished by a coalition of parties, shows that neither was right in principle, and that both were wrong in practice.

CHARLES THE SECOND.

It is difficult to determine which character is to be preferred to serve the public, that of Cromwell who violated his professions of religion and democracy, or that of Charles the Second, who made no professions of principle, and surrendered himself, as a man, to reckless indulgences, and

¹ “Cromwell was not a philosopher,” says Guizot, “he did not act in obedience to systematic and premeditated views; but he was guided in his government by a superior instinct and practical good sense of a man destined by the hand of God to govern.”

* * * “He had learned that no government is, or can be, the work of man’s will alone; he had recognized, as essential to its production, the hand of God, the action

of time, and a variety of other causes apart from human deliberation. Entering, so to speak, into council with these superior powers, he regarded himself as their representative and minister, by the right of his genius, and of his manifold successes.”—*Hist. Oliver Cromwell*, Vol. II, p. 101. *The rights of genius*—are self-assertive. This is an interesting subject to study in connection with *the duties of genius*.

as a king, to the vilest bribes. Cromwell's assumptions were popular, inasmuch as they favored the theory of popular rights, and deferential submission to Divine Providence. He was a man of business and comprehensive views, and he was deemed eminently to be a man of God. He professed to believe in the efficacy of prayer, and in the mysteries of faith,—and while he exercised no judgment above the nature of man, he had the supreme arrogance to inspire his followers with the belief that his wisdom was derived from God. He was a hypocrite in his religion, a fanatic in his politics and a despot in his rule.¹ Charles the Second was popular because his accession to the throne afforded gratifying evidence that the British Constitution was still acknowledged. The royalists were elated because they could rejoice in the return of party power. The people, who had been cheated by promises, and deceived by professions—were frantic for a change,—though ignorant of the sources of their troubles and misery, and of the means of relief. They could not understand why they should be so constantly exposed to dangers and distractions under the government of Cromwell,—and they preferred the uncertainties of the future, under a king, of whose rule they were ignorant,—to the continuance of a Parliament, under whose rule they were suffering. Present misery is a mean counsellor. It is cowardly. The people were ready in their frenzied zeal to join Cromwell in taking the life of Charles the First, and to denounce royalty as a crime; and now they were equally prepared to denounce republicanism as treason—and to re-proclaim royalty as an indispensable condition. Hereditary right lost its charm when it failed to give protec-

¹ Sidney was a republican, but he was a democrat. He favored lawful revolution, but he was loyal to the constitution of his own country. The difference between Sidney and Cromwell may be seen in Sidney's views respecting the trial of Charles I., given in his own language:—"I do not know the particulars, but the truth of what passed I do very well remember. I was at Penhurst when the act for the trial passed, and coming up to town, I heard my name was put in, and that those that were nominated for judges were then in the painted chamber. I presently went thither, heard the act read, and found my own name with others. A debate was raised how they should proceed upon it; and after having been sometime silent to hear what those would say who had the directing of that business, I did positively oppose Cromwell,

Bradshawe, and others, who would have the trial to go on, and drew my reasons from these two points: first, the King could be tried by no court; secondly, that no man could be tried by that court. This being alleged in vain, and Cromwell using these formal words, 'I tell you we will cut off his head with the crown upon it,' I replied, 'You may take your own course, I cannot stop you, but I will keep myself clear from having any hand in the business,'—and immediately went out of the room, and never returned." In Blencowe's *Sidney Papers*, p. 287—Sidney goes on to say,—“I had an intention which is not very fit for a letter.” Sir James Macintosh interprets this passage by the supposition that Sidney's intention was to procure the concurrence of both houses of parliament in the deposition of the King.”—*Hist. of Parties*, Vol. I, p. 56.

tion, and for the same reason democracy lost its power when it was false to principle. Whence these inconsistencies? Are they to be traced to unwarrantable motives of ambition, to desperate partisans who are indifferent to means provided they can command results? Are they the fruits of ignorance, or of a misguided zeal that discards experience and holds knowledge in contempt? Are people ignorant of what they want, or of the means to supply their wants? Are people ignorant of principles—that they so seldom succeed in government, or of men—that government is so badly administered? These are practical questions, and where citizenship is a privilege should find practical answers in the events of history. Montesquieu had substantial reasons for doubting the moral foundations of a monarchy,—but of these most people were but little informed.¹ England was misgoverned by Charles the First, by Cromwell, and what evidence was it that influenced the people to believe that they were to be better protected by the government of Charles the Second? Was it in the form of the government which they had so recently discarded by violence and blood? Was it in the character of the new King who was yet to be tried; in the wisdom of his probable advisers; in the new Parliament yet to be elected; in the church reforms; or, in the agreements of party,—all yet to be determined? No! Nothing could be more uncertain. Mere change is to be the remedy, but to what, no one knows, and to whom, no one cares. It is almost a proverb, that we

—“rather bear those ills we have,
Than fly to others that we know not of.”

And yet, a suffering people are ready for any change, provided it be a change, that they may have a chance to escape from a greater to a lesser evil. When deliberate judgment is needed most, it seems to have no place in society. Public opinion is characterized by the impulses of passion, and led by the delusive appeals of party. If patriotism were understood—what was there in the Restoration to gladden the hearts of the people?

Charles the Second was a profligate. He had no ambition to be great, no conscience to be honest, no pride to be decent. To him marriage was a

¹ In speaking of the genius of a monarchy, and quoting the political testament of Cardinal Richelieu, Montesquieu says, “If there should chance to be some unlucky, honest man among the people, a prince should take care not to employ him. So true is it that virtue is not the spring of this government.”—*Esprit des Loix* I. III, c. 5. France under Louis XIV. was just

such a monarchy as this.—See *Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 121.

² Such was the effect of the fascinating manners and specious qualities of Charles,” says Prof. Smyth, “that he was never hated or despised in the degree which he deserved.”—*Lectures on Modern History*, p. 828.

ality, woman a pleasure, and chastity a joke. His natural instincts were generous, but he had no firmness to be just. With ignoble motives, he had an imperfect conception of friendship, and but little power to be grateful. Although he was a slave to importunity, but few could dupe him. "It has been remarked of Charles," says Hume, "that he never said a foolish thing nor ever did a wise one."¹ He loved pleasure, and hated business,—and while he asked for no condition above that of the sensualist, he objected to no measure so long as he was exempted from official cares, and had an unrestrained access to the public treasury. When young he was much among the Puritans, and frequently indulged in unguarded mirth at their expense. One would suppose from the recklessness of his habits, and his indifference to character,—that he felt justified in omitting all their virtues provided he was but faithful in imitating their vices. He was evidently of a benevolent disposition, and was free from the spirit of persecution and revenge, and yet his frivolity excited the contempt of his attendants, and his sense of honor was no guaranty against acts of shame and injustice. Rapin has but little charity for him. He says, "He became as sanguinary as he had hitherto appeared merciful, and as soon as he had power in his hands, made his enemies feel the most terrible effects of his vengeance."

What could be expected from such a King, when public affairs were in the most uncertain and distracted condition?² When unscrupulous parties and desperate factions were springing up to renew old animosities and degrading recollections, and returning to unsettled issues with increased prejudices and intensified passions? He was welcomed by all classes with manifestations of uncommon joy. Some with pride and exultation, some with mingled hope and fear,—but all with apparent pleasure had the desperate consolation that his coming could make matters no worse even if he failed to make them better. He was popular, and in an aristocratic sense—even loved. "With the restoration of the King," is the language of Burnet, "a spirit of extravagant joy spread over the nation, that brought on with it the throwing off the very professions of virtue and piety. All ended in entertainments and drunkenness, which over-run the three kingdoms to such a degree, that it very much corrupted all their morals. Under the color of drinking the King's health, there were great disorders and much riot everywhere."³ These manifestations of joy, it may be said,

¹ Hume's *England*, Vol. VI, p. 292.

² The Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames," says Macaulay, "and burned the ships of war which lay at Chatham. It was said that, on the very day of that great humilia-

tion, the King feasted with the ladies of his seraglio, and amused himself with hunting a moth about the supper room."—*Hist. of Eng.* Vol. I, p. 179.

³ Vol. I, p. 93.

were apparently justified, if full credence be given to the brave and benignant assurances made by the King in his Declaration from Breda,¹ and in his letters to Gen. Monk, to the House of Peers, to the House of Commons, and to the Lord Mayor of London. So great was the satisfaction of the Commons that they voted five hundred pounds to Sir John Grenville, the bearer of the King's communications.² "The calamities of his house," says Macaulay, "the heroic death of his father, his own long sufferings and romantic adventures, made him an object of tender interest. His return had delivered the country from an intolerable bondage. Recalled by the voice of both the contending factions, he was the very man to arbitrate between them; and in some respects he was well qualified for the task. He had received from nature excellent parts and a happy temper. His education had been such as might have been expected to develop his understanding, and to form him to the practice of every public and private virtue. He had passed through all varieties of fortune, and had seen both sides of human nature."³

With such an experience, and having "seen both sides of human nature;" taught by select and accomplished teachers, and influenced by the imposing associations of birth, and dignified by position; endowed with mental capacities sufficient for self-respect and judgment, and with patriotic sentiments trained to regard himself as the rightful heir to the crown of England, and to be the instrument of its restoration, and the avenger of a father's death,—one would have supposed that he would have chosen for himself a patriotic part, the part of honor and wisdom, a part that should in some degree redeem the errors of royalty, if not correct the mistakes, and punish the crimes, committed in the name of republicanism. This was not to be. Though republican rule had failed to bless the people, royalty had not yet triumphed.

This failure should not be attributed entirely to the deficiencies of the king. The immoralities of his time were epidemic.⁴ He had not caused

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, p. 15.

² "So great and sudden was this," says Lord Clarendon, "that a servant of the King's, who, for near ten years together, had been in prisons, and under confinements, only for being the King's servant, and would, but three months before, have been put to have undergone a shameful death, if he had been known to have seen the King, should be now rewarded for bringing a message from him! From this time there was such an emulation and impatience in Lords, Commons, and City, and generally over the kingdom, who should

make the most lively expressions of their duty and of their joy, that a man could not but wonder where those people dwelt who had done all the mischief, and kept the King so many years from enjoying the comfort and support of such excellent subjects." —Vol. VI, p. 761.

³ Hist. Eng. Vol. I, p. 156.

⁴ "The truth is," says Prof. Smyth, "that this period was marked by a sort of conspiracy against all sobriety and order, against all liberty and law, against all dignity and happiness, public and private; and we must not suffer our taste for pleasantries, and our

them, nor was it in his power to banish them by proclamation. He saw but little in others to respect,—and he cared but little what others cared for him. He saw that politics was a mere game, as practised by the most pious of men. He saw that what his father lost was won by Cromwell, and what Cromwell lost was won by himself,—and without merit except that of mere birth, and he doubtless was at a loss to comprehend why men should be willing to make sacrifices for principle, when success appeared to crown the ambition of a subject with regal honors at the expense of a king—who fell from high condition with no circumstance that would not have attended the fall of the meanest peasant.¹ In addition to the demoralization of society, which always follows in the desolate track of civil war,—the king could not but remember the cant and hypocrisy of the Puritans in their excessive zeal, and their repeated failures to redeem their pledges in giving peace to the nation. How could he respect their judgment, when in council they gave birth to no system of government; or their motives, when their acts of administration were in contradiction to their declarations of policy? The moment the Republicans had succeeded by the usurpations of Cromwell, the dissolution of their party commenced. Parties ignorant of the means of progressive life, are born only to die. Faith without corresponding practice has no vitality. The spasmodic measures of the Republicans, were thought to be measures of energy, as they were in a limited sense; nevertheless they were but the mere death-throes of the party. They passed from error to error, from blunder to blunder,—and were constantly engaged in the mournful duty of correcting their own mistakes, from month to month, from year to year, until they sought party life at the expense of the existence of the government itself, and in the power of coercion,—the greatest error of all. Seeing the gross fallacies of these fanatics, claiming as they did, God as their leader, Liberty as their motto, and Equality of Rights as their purpose; and failing to disclose their theory of government in a definite form, and to reduce it to practice,—there need be but little wonder expressed why Charles the Second should ascend the throne of his fathers, other than as a skeptic, both as to men and things, and utterly indifferent as to the part

admiration of shining talents, to betray us into a forgetfulness of every graver virtue which can seriously occupy our reflection or engage our respect.”—*Mod. Hist.*, p. 328.

¹ “According to him,” says Macaulay, “every person was to be bought. But some people haggled more about their price than others; and when the haggling was very obstinate and very skilful, it was called by some fine name. The chief trick by which clever men kept up the price of their abili-

ties was called integrity. The chief trick by which handsome women kept up the price of their beauty was called modesty. The love of God, the love of country, the love of family, the love of friends, were phrases of the same sort, delicate and convenient synonyms for the love of self. Thinking thus of mankind, Charles naturally cared very little what they thought of him.”—*Hist. of Eng.*, Vol. 1, p. 157.

he should take in public affairs,—provided he could enjoy the pleasures of self-indulgence, which though doubtful in their tendencies, were certain in their possession. When he came to power he was surrounded by the Cavaliers, the Roundheads, the Presbyterians, the Papists,¹ the Royalists and the Republicans. All alike had been humbled by grievous disappointments, and elated by occasional victory. All had assented to the Restoration, all came to bend the knee, to proffer counsel, and to claim protection. The King, in his joyous disposition to meet his dutiful subjects in their new-born harmony, received them all with undisguised cordiality. He promised everything to everybody, and soon found that he could be true to nobody.² The regicides punished, the Roundheads plead their efficiency in the patriotic struggle to save the Constitution from regal encroachments. They had exposed themselves to the rage of the soldiers in attempting to save the life of the King, and “had taken chief part in bringing back the royal family.”

Although the throne was restored to the Royalists, the Commons and the Church were in the hands of the Presbyterians and Independents. The bishops had been deprived of their seats in the House of Lords, the Presbyterian Directory had taken the place of the Liturgy,—but before Presbyterianism had fully prevailed,—both bishops and presbyteries were neutralized alike by the accession to power of the Independents. The church was detached from State, and each congregation was declared to be independent, not of

¹ “In the present age,” says Cooke, “the Catholic religion is in England merely the faith of a sect. Their views are bounded by the prospect of a perfect equality with their fellow subjects, and they are no more dangerous to our Constitution than any other of those numerous religious sects with which the kingdom is so rife. But in the reign of Charles II. it was far different. Popery was then only another name for unlimited power in the monarch, and unlimited oppression to the subject.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 8. (1837.) Such were the views of John Hampden,—expressed during the debates upon the Exclusion Bill.

² The expressions of the King and of his court,” says Dalrymple, “were calculated to restore good humor to the people, and to reconcile the animosity of parties almost spent with contention. To the Presbyterian clergy, who waited upon him in a body, Charles said, “I will make you as happy as

I am myself.” To his parliament, “I will as soon burn *Magna Charta*, as forget the act of oblivion.” When the King heard any member was discontented, he used to say, “What have I done to deserve this gentleman’s dislike? I wish he and I were acquainted, that I might give him satisfaction,” etc. * * * “Yet,” Dalrymple continues, “amidst these promising appearances between Prince and people, there lurked the fruits of past dissensions, and the seeds of future ones.” * * * “Many of the republicans, too, from nature could not, and others from conscience would not, relinquish their old principles; and, when the republic they adored was no more to be obtained, they converted their hatred of monarchy into jealousy of the monarch.”—*Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, pp. 23, 25. It was wittily said, “That the act of oblivion (passed Sept. 1660) was an act of pardon for his enemies, and of oblivion for his friends.”—*Ibid*, p. 26.

advice or counsel, but of all arbitrary external decrees. The Cavaliers were actuated by mingled motives of zeal and hate, and were impatient for the restoration of their party. The clergy could not forget the Triers of Cromwell, the prohibition of the use of the Common Prayer, both in public and private, and the many indignities which were put upon Episcopacy. These had been reciprocated by Dissenters. Parties recently united in harmony to establish the Restoration, were soon divided and engaged in new conflicts. The Church was in confusion, and the new administration was without a policy. The chief adviser of the King, was the Earl of Clarendon, chancellor of the realm, who had enjoyed largely the confidence of Charles the First. He had "shared the exile and directed the political conduct of Charles the Second." He was able, learned and arrogant. He was strongly attached to the Church, and it was certain he had no love for the Roundheads.¹ Though long absent from the country, he probably was well informed of the true condition of things at home, and if he committed errors as a statesman, they were probably the errors of his passions, and not of his heart. In the midst of unyielding differences, he attempted to adjust a system of settlement that would prove acceptable to all. Leading men representing the different parties favored the attempt as commendable, but no one was willing to concede that agreement might follow. Each was for himself, no one for all. The King secretly desired to meliorate the condition of the Catholics, Clarendon and the Church saw no safety in Papacy, and the Presbyterians could see nothing but danger in both. Fanatics seldom compromise. Each claiming God as his leader—all are infallible. Compromise can come only from men who are just, when they have power to do wrong. Clarendon could make no settlement, he would consent to none. The Commons, by whose authority the royal family had been recalled was in session, and it was controlled by the Presbyterians. Until dissolved, no new election could be ordered, and no change effected to re-establish the old ecclesiastical system. The Court was silent, the king having given private assurances to the Presbyterians, before Restoration, that his subjects should enjoy liberty of conscience. These promises he repeated with all sincerity, and in the belief, no doubt, that he would be able to redeem them in good faith. "He wished," he said, "to see the spiritual jurisdiction divided between bishops and synods. The Liturgy should be revised by a body of learned divines, one-half of whom should be Presbyterians. The questions respecting the surplice, the posture at the Eucharist, and the sign of the cross in baptism, should be settled in a way

¹ "Other Royalists," says Macaulay, "who made little pretension to piety, yet loved the Episcopal Church because she was the foe of their foes. They valued a prayer or a ceremony, not on account of the comfort which it conveyed to themselves, but on account of the vexation which it gave to the Roundheads, etc."—*Hist. Eng.*, Vol. I, p. 140.

which would set tender consciences at ease. When the King had thus laid asleep the vigilance of those whom he most feared, he dissolved the Parliament."

The Parliament had already voted sufficient appropriations for the support of government, though nothing was voted for a standing army. The King had also given his assent to the Acts of Indemnity and Oblivion,¹ which were immediately confirmed on the meeting of the new Parliament. The election took place early in 1661. The party of the Crown and Church was victorious. The excitement was great beyond precedent, and the triumphant party hailed their period of relief as their time for action. "The House of Commons was," says Macaulay, "during some years more zealous for royalty than the King, more zealous for Episcopacy than the bishops. Charles and Clarendon were almost terrified at the completeness of their own success." It was with great difficulty that the Cavaliers were prevented from rescinding the Act of Indemnity, instead of confirming it, as they did. If they had been left free, they doubtless would have afforded another example of disgraceful retaliation under the charitable head of Christian forbearance. Extreme party measures were at once proposed, and intolerant laws enacted. Penal statutes against non-conformists were passed, as if nothing had been said of compromise, as if nothing had been promised by the King. He struggled to save his word, but fell. The return of royalty had not brought back integrity to the kingdom. The Church was restored to its ancient condition without change, but not without dishonor to its royal head. Monarchy, the Church, and the Stuarts had stood together. They were again united in power,—the Church was safe in its exclusiveness, and royalty in its possession of the throne.

It is not the purpose of this chapter to consider the religious feuds of

¹ The King "longed very impatiently," to approve this Bill. In a complimentary speech to Parliament, July 8, 1661, he said,—“Let it be in no man’s power to charge me or you with breach of our word or promise, which can never be a good ingredient to our future security. Let us look forward not backward; and never think of what is past, except men put us in mind of it, by repeating faults we had forgot; and then let us remember no more than what concerns those very persons.—God hath wrought a wonderful miracle in settling us as he hath done.” That parliament was in harmony with the joyous declarations of the King may be inferred from the language of the Speaker, on this occa-

sion: “That we might with some cheerfulness see your majesty’s face, we have brought our brother Benjamin with us? I mean your Act of Oblivion; I take the boldness to call it yours, for so it is by many titles, etc.” * * * “Sir, hereby you have made this a great holiday; and we shall observe it with joy and thanksgiving. Upon such solemn festivals, there useth to be a second service, an anthem, and a collect, or at least an offering. My anthem shall be, ‘*Quid tibi retribuam, Domine?*’ And my collect, a short report of your revenue.” The King’s religion was evidently understood by the Speaker, and in a way most agreeable to his majesty. —*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV, pp. 211, 213.

this period,—but only to refer to them as elements which served to embitter party strife and to add to party animosities. The same issues are still open and undecided, and while their full import may be recognized in the political affairs of the nation, it is not necessary to participate in the discussion of the opposing dogmas themselves.

In this connection the elegant language of Edmund Burke would not be out of place—in reference to the impropriety of connecting party politics with the sacred interests of religion, in the pulpit. The same rule that would exclude party politics from the pulpit—will exclude sectarianism from the pages of this work. “Politics and the pulpit,” said Burke, “are terms that have little agreement. No sound ought to be heard in the church but the voice of healing charity. The cause of civil liberty and civil government gains as little as that of religion, by this confusion of duties. Those who quit their proper character, to assume what does not belong to them, are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they have and of the character they assume. Wholly unacquainted with the world, in which they are so fondly meddling, and inexperienced in all its affairs, on which they pronounce with so much confidence, they have nothing of politics but the passions they excite. Surely the church is a place where one day’s truce ought to be allowed to the dissensions and animosities of mankind.” Democracy favors civil and religious liberty alike. It prescribes no tests in religious belief, no conformity in religious opinions.

It would be interesting and instructive to glance at the condition of Scotland¹ and Ireland, from the Cromwellian period to that of the Revolution,—and to note the many acts of oppression to which the Scotch and Irish were subjected, but the limits of this work will not permit. The hardships of England were pleasures in comparison.

The Restoration gave new life to Episcopacy. This new life came to the Church in its weakness, when the possession of power led to its abuse. It lost no opportunity to favor the prerogatives of the crown, or to dwell upon her favorite theme of non-resistance. This absurd doctrine was urged with sickening panegyric, and with that misguided zeal which disgusts, but does not convince.² The power of the clergy was lessened, and

¹ See Macaulay, VOL. I, pp. 464-6.

² “The Tories,” says Cooke, “had shown themselves a party rather of religionists than of politicians. Their political creed was part of their religion, and consisted of principles for which they claimed a divine origin.”—*Hist. of Party*, VOL. I, p. 342. The University of Cambridge declared that

“Kings derive not their titles from the people, but from God; that to him only they are accountable; that it belongs not to subjects either to create or censure, but to honor and obey their sovereign, who comes to be so by a fundamental hereditary right of succession, which no religion, no law, no fault, or forfeiture, can alter or dimin-

the Church endangered its best friends and its own foundations.

The views of Hobbes—that the rights of opinion should be controlled by the will of the king, whatever they might be, were suited to the age and gave encouragement to the frivolities of fashion, and licentious habits and manners which universally prevailed.¹ Individual accountability was regarded with indifference, and private life became dishonored. Wit and ridicule succeeded cant and hypocrisy, and as the profession of religion without its practice, had not saved the nation from misrule and anarchy,—vice with her delusive charms clothed the voluptuary with honor, and gave fascination and refinement to lust and guilt. “The clergy,” says Macaulay, “for a time, made war on schism with so much vigor that they had little leisure to make war on vice. The ribaldry of Ethridge and Wycherley was, in the presence and under the special sanction of the head of the Church, publicly recited by female lips in female ears, while the author of *Pilgrim’s Progress* languished in a dungeon for the crime of proclaiming the Gospel to the poor. It is an unquestionable and most instructive fact, that the years during which the political power of the Anglican hierarchy was in the zenith, were precisely the years during which national virtue was at the lowest point.”²

The dissolute habits of the King, and the intolerant and hateful measures of the dominant party alarmed the most prudent of the Cavaliers, and disgusted the most honest. Even the Puritan rule, with all its destructive fanaticism, was safer, better, surer. Some did not hesitate to wish its return. The Court was but a lewd scene of gayety,³ and Parliament an unthinking council of party strife and bitterness. Legislation was characterized by the unforgiving passions of the bigot, and by the ignorance and dishonesty of trading politicians. The government was paralyzed by party,

ish.”—*Ibid*, Vol. I, p. 105. Filmer says, “A man is bound to obey the King’s command against law, nay, in some cases, against divine laws.”—*Patriarchia*, p. 100.

¹ “Hobbes’s politics,” says Hume, “are fitted only to promote tyranny, and his ethics to encourage licentiousness. Though an enemy to religion, he partakes nothing of the spirit of skepticism; but is as positive and dogmatical as if human reason, and his reason in particular, could attain a thorough conviction in these subjects. In his own person, he is represented to have been a man of virtue; a character nowise surprising, notwithstanding his libertine system of ethics. He died in 1679, aged ninety-one.”—*Hist. Eng.*, Vol. v. p. 531.

² *Hist. of Eng.*, Vol. I, p. 169.

³ On Sunday evening, the 1st of February, 1685, Evelyn was at Whitehall. A week after he recorded his impressions of the scene which he there witnessed. “I can never forget,” is his language, “the inexpressible luxury and profaneness, gaming, and all dissoluteness, and as it were total forgetfulness of God, it being Sunday evening. The King sitting and toying with his concubines, Portsmouth, Cleveland, and Mazarine, etc.; a French boy singing love songs in that glorious gallery; whilst above twenty of the great courtiers and other dissolute persons were at Bassot around a large table, a bank of at least two thousand in gold before them.”

and party was demoralized by pitiful experiments, and disgraceful failures. Why should it be otherwise? How could it be otherwise? When men are unfit for society, they are still less fit for government. It was well known that Clarendon was the responsible minister, and though his greatest trouble was in trying to repress and neutralize the follies and vices of the King, yet all looked to him as to the great source of their disappointment and sufferings. He was hated for what others were permitted to do, and for what he could not do himself. His personal qualities were permitted to prejudice his public acts. He could not abandon his party without dishonor, and his party could not save him and save itself. He was too stern for the Commons, too grave for the Court. He was too unrelenting to the Puritan, who dislikes his own likeness in others, too honest for the royalist. He seriously offended the Presbyterians of Scotland, and the Papists of Ireland. Whatever was wrong in public affairs was traced to him. He sold Dunkirk,¹ made war with Holland, amassed riches with selfish motives, and made ostentatious displays offensive to the pious, and distasteful to the envious. He was dismissed by the King, and impeached by the Commons. He fled from the country, and was doomed to perpetual exile.² Here was another experiment, but no remedy. The disgrace of Clarendon did not reform the King, nor purify the Court. It had all the external show of an indignant rebuke, but it was not the rebuke of conscious duty. It was from policy, not wisdom,—from passion not principle. It did not improve the people, nor reform the corrupt and disabled Parliament.³ It was a party

¹ "The sale of Dunkirk, says Cooke, "is a blot upon the annals of the country."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 8. Clarendon never disguised the reason of the sale. He writes to D'Estrades,—“However his majesty, even contrary to the advance of most of those with whom he hath consulted, will cause the town of Dunkirk, with all the cannon, arms, and ammunition, to be delivered into the possession of the King of France, and will lend him such of the troops as he shall desire, upon the payment of five millions of ready money; the present payment being so absolutely necessary for His Majesty's affairs, that the confidence he hath in the King of France's friendship would have persuaded him to have hoped for a good part thereof, by way of loan, if this overture of Dunkirk had not been made.”—*Clarendon's State Papers*, Supp. to Vol. III, p. 24.

² There were seventeen Articles of Im-

peachment against Clarendon. He replied to them by letter, and the letter was delivered to parliament after his departure from the country. He was sufficiently acquainted with his enemies to be unwilling to trust his life in their hands, and as they could not have the satisfaction of taking off his head, they indignantly voted that his written defence "should be burnt by the common-hangman."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. IV, p. 898.

³ The subject of frequent parliaments was earnestly discussed during the reign of Charles the Second,—but with little or no success. The first was the Convention Parliament which met April 25th, 1660; the second, the "Pensionary Parliament," so called, which met May 8, 1661, and continued eighteen years. It was a parliament of seventeen sessions, and was dissolved by proclamation, January 24, 1678-9. During the sessions there were frequent adjourn-

expedient,—a diversion to a smaller sacrifice to prevent a larger. The government was willing to lessen its strength to conceal its weakness.¹

The troubles which succeeded the fall of Clarendon, in the counsels of the King, soon exemplified the real weakness of the government. Its want of wisdom to submit to counsel, led to the appointment of advisors who had no advice to give, but were ready to act according to the requisitions, or the necessities of party. It was a CABAL, not a Ministry. It was truly named, and as such, it will ever be known in history.² The Cabal con-

ments. The third Parliament was convened March 6, 1678-9,—and was dissolved by proclamation in May. The fourth Parliament met October 7, 1679, was prorogued to 17th, and adjourned to 30th, and after seven prorogations—met for business, Oct. 21st, 1680. Fifth and last Parliament, met at Oxford, March 21st, 1680-1.

In the House of Lords, Nov. 20, 1675, the Earl of Shaftesbury said,—“That it is according to the constitution of the government, the ancient laws and statutes of this realm, that there should be frequent and new Parliaments, and the practice of all ages, till this last, hath been accordingly. Parliaments, both long before and after the conquest, were held three times a year, viz:—Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, during the space of eight days for each time, and so continued with some variations, as to the times of calling, and length of holding; but always very short, until the reign of Edward III., in the fourth year of whose reign there was a law made,—‘That Parliaments should be holden every year, once, or more often:’ and how this law is to be understood, whether of a new parliament every year, or calling the old, is most manifest, by the practice not only of all the ages before, but of some hundreds of years since that law; prorogations or long adjournments, being a thing never heard of until latter years.”—*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV. Appendix, p. LXXI. In the House of Commons, 1680, Mr. Booth, afterwards Earl of Warrington, said,—“What kings performed such enterprises, and did such wonderful things, as those who still consulted their parliaments? And who had more the command of the people’s

purses than those kings who met the natives frequently in Parliament? As witness, Henry I., Edward I., Edward III., Henry V., Henry VIII., Queen Elizabeth; and what kings were so mean and obscure, despised by their neighbors, and abhorred by their subjects, as those who left off the use of parliaments and doted upon their favorites; as witness, William II., John, Henry III., Edward II., Richard II., Henry VI. I think it is undeniable that when the King leaves off parliaments, he forsakes his interests, he refuses the good and chooses the bad.”—*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV., p. 1270.

¹ See Macaulay’s *Hist. of Eng.*, VOL. I, p. 181.

² “It happened by a whimsical coincidence,” says Macaulay, “that, in 1671, the cabinet consisted of five persons, the initial letters of whose names made up the word Cabal: Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale.”—*Hist. Eng.*, VOL. I, p. 198. In speaking of this period, Prof. Smyth says, “The reader instantly perceives, from the first appearance of the celebrated ministry called the Cabal, to the end of Charles’ reign, that the most important struggle is still carrying on between the power of the crown and the rights of the people; and that the reign of Charles II. is but a sort of supplement to the Great Rebellion in the time of his father.” Hume, though inclined by party incredulity to favor royalty, was not bold enough to deny the evidence of treason against the people, and he recites it in a supplementary note in his history. He says, “It must be allowed that the difficulties, and even inconsistencies, attending the schemes of the Cabal,

sisted of Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. Sir Thomas Clifford had been active in the House of Commons, and was more influenced by passion than by any love of principle. Lord Arlington endeavored to be something to all men, and succeeded in being nothing to the world. Buckingham was a man of pleasure, and he claimed to be a man of taste. As he was true to no party, he was made a tool of by all parties. He is classed by Cooke as among the "occasional allies of the Whig party." He says,— This nobleman was naturally and essentially a minion of the Court; every popular vote he gave was prompted either by resentment against the King, or fear of the Commons. He, Lord Percy and the philosopher Hobbes, formed the triumvirate, who enjoyed the reputation of having made Charles what he was," etc.¹ Ashley believed in all parties, and he appeared to be impartial in serving all with equal faithfulness. He was so skilful in his transitions that the people were almost disposed to regard him as a statesman of progress. He was always ready for a start and a change. Lauderdale was distinguished for his coarseness and treachery. At heart he was believed to be a Presbyterian, and yet, he was always prepared with all the hateful appointments of force to compel his countrymen to abandon the covenant and embrace Episcopacy. He was willing, probably, to serve Charles the Second to compensate for his disloyalty to Charles the First. The renegade is a convenient tool,—prized for what he is willing to do, and detested for what he has done. Each member of this celebrated Cabal doubtless had special qualities to commend him to royal favor; and they were all sufficiently cunning to assume a gravity, and display a character—that commended them for a time to the people. Whether they could be classed as statesmen, or as adventurous politicians,—it is not necessary to inquire. In their union, the old adage was fully verified, which asserts a fact—if it does not convey a compliment,—“that birds of a feather flock together.”²

But, in this era of sin and degradation, so abandoned to profligacy, corruption, and almost every species of wickedness,—were there no honest men, no bold patriots to assert the integrity of the government and the laws, no pride of citizenship, no democratic party to defend the rights of

are so numerous and obvious, that one feels at first an inclination to deny the reality of these schemes, and to suppose them entirely the chimeras of calumny and faction. But the utter impossibility of accounting, by any other hypothesis, for those strange measures embraced by the court, as well as for the numerous circumstances which accompanied them, obliges us to acknowl-

edge, (though there remains no direct evidence of it,) that a formal plan was laid for changing the religion, and subverting the Constitution of England; and that the King and the ministry were in reality conspirators against the people.”—Hist. Eng. Vol. VI, pp. 126, 127.

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 50.

² See APPENDIX C.

the people, and to save the nation from tyranny and disgrace? Were all guilty alike, and without the force and pride of principle; without the dignity and courage of duty to denounce treason, to rebuke immoralities, the prostitution of justice, the unbridled lusts of royalty, the culpable and profane neglects of religion? Was nature so slandered in man, that man could see no safety in virtue, no danger in vice? Was humanity so depraved, that woman loathed the refinements of society, and found bliss in the indecencies of life? Was the nation deserted by God, and abandoned to the chance games of trading politicians, that so many acts of sin were permitted, that so many years were allowed to pass barren of goodness and wisdom, of noble endeavor and of virtuous felicity? Though the laws and institutions of man were mocked and derided,—had the laws of God been suspended or repealed,—that a whole generation could abandon itself to ungodly passions with irreverent impunity?

Such questions, although they indicate honest inquiry, imply doubt in that Providence which is the rule of Him who cannot err, and whose will is the unchangeable law that gives existence to the immortal soul, and life to all material things. The works of God are eternal. There is no change in their nature. They never cease. Their design may be subverted by sin, their blessings changed to calamities by ignorance, and their beauties obscured by error,—but these perversions are overruled by an All-wise Providence, and made to declare to an observing world the great truth that without righteousness greatness and happiness are impossible. Divine goodness pervades the universe, and its laws are the conditions upon which all blessings depend. The reign of wickedness is but the delusive flame of an hour that poisons and destroys the life it can neither give nor save. It rises and falls upon the accumulated heap of its own ruins, but it can never obstruct or pollute the source of all truth, nor lessen its divine power and beneficence. A generation is but a moment with God, but its lessons abide forever.

It has been truly said that the history of England is the history of liberty.¹ It was the declaration of Alfred, the greatest of all the Saxon Kings,—“That it was just the English should remain forever as free as their own thoughts,” thus proudly claiming the high privileges which belong to merit and character. The conflicts of royalty,² the

¹ The history of England is the history of liberty, and of the influence which the spirit of it, kept alive during a long revolution of ages, has had upon the constitution, the religion, the wealth, the power, and, above all, upon the dignity of the national character of the English. — *Dalrymple's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 1.

² “After the reigns of the two first Norman Princes,” says Dalrymple, “the Saxons and Normans, respecting their common origin and common rights, united their interests, and made the great charter an original condition of the settlement of the crown upon Henry I. an instrument of liberty which, by means of parliaments,

changes of parliament,¹ the honest demands of the people, in the due processes of time, have all resulted in a more extended freedom, in a more permanent security. The Church,² the crown, the parliament, the people, all, each in its own way, had done right and had done wrong. This perpetual struggle between right and wrong is stayed by no man's will, is continued by no man's power,—and yet all men are appointed to perform their parts in the battle of life. There can be no exemptions. Whether active or idle, positive or neutral, strong or weak, right or wrong, good or evil,—all have a mission, all have a destiny. As it is an axiom in physical science that not a particle of matter can be destroyed,—so it is equally an axiom in morals—that whatever is right in the soul is indestructible in Providence.

Some profess to believe in the controlling hand of Providence in the life of individuals, but absurdly doubt this great truth when applied to society. In a letter written by the Earl of Essex to Mr. Harbord, 1675, he says,—

established the political, and of juries, the civil rights of the citizens; and which, by subjecting to the laws, and to the laws only, their property, their persons, and their honor, conferred badges of distinction upon Englishmen, unknown to the citizens of Rome and of Sparta. The struggles of their posterity to get this charter renewed, which, although confirmed above thirty times by different Princes, (1773) was seldom renewed without compulsion, and their attempts to extend it, kept the flame of liberty alive." * * "In the breaches of royal successions, ramparts were formed for the defence of the people." * * "Advantages were in the same way taken of domestic dissensions in royal families." * * "The subject was satisfied to find occasions, whether in the weaknesses or the crimes of human nature, to restrain the power of the crown, even by degrading the person who wore it."—*Memoirs*, Vol. I, pp. 2, 3, 4.

¹ In speaking of the "Restoration Parliament," Prof. Smith says,—"It must be allowed that more care was taken of the liberties of the subject by the House of Commons than the general principles of human nature would have led us to expect; and this is an important merit that belongs to the Presbyterians, who constituted so large a portion of its members, particularly

to Sir Matthew Hale, the judge so justly celebrated. He endeavored to take proper securities for the Constitution,—to come to some understanding with the King on this subject before he was finally restored; but all proposals of this kind were overruled."—*Modern History*, p. 301.

² "The zeal for independence," says Dalrymple, "was not confined to the laity. Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was at the head of the nobles, who maintained the first great struggle for *Magna Charta*, against King John. After the same act of security had by the aid of the bishops and abbots been extorted from his son, they stood around it, with burning tapers in their hands, whilst it was read in parliament, and denounced curses against those who should infringe it. They concurred with the laity in most of their attempts to humble their princes." * * * "The united spirit of laymen and churchmen rose equally against ecclesiastical tyranny." * * * "In the reign of Henry III. the dignified clergy refused to submit to taxes imposed upon them by the Pope, although submission was recommended by the King. And the bishop of London exclaimed upon this occasion, "That, if the mitre was taken from his head, he would clap a helmet in its place."—*Memoirs*, Vol. I, pp. 4, 5.

"This country has been perpetually rent and torn since his majesty's restoration. I can compare it to nothing better than the flinging the reward upon the death of a deer among a pack of hounds, where every one pulls and tears what he can for himself."

The society of this period, like all periods of humanity, was divided into classes, and these into parties—according to professed principles or special interests. Each party had its honest but credulous men who were willing to follow dishonest leaders, with indefinite motives, and each party had its share of patriotic men, who, though able in mind and noble in character, were weak in numbers. The masses were ignorant, indifferent and corrupt. The Tories, in power, abused the prerogatives of government for party purposes, and made party the ignoble instrument of unrestrained indecencies, and inglorious bondage.¹ Not only are the party features of the times to be particularly noted, but the spirit of party in defence of those times, even a hundred years later by tory writers, is to be considered.² Though the amiable Hume admitted the indispensable importance of political parties to the cause of liberty,³ he was reluctant to acknowledge the disgraceful conduct of the tories in power, or to give evidence, which he possessed, to prove treason against the King and his ministers. After he had written the history of this period, "he made inquiries in France," says Prof. Smyth, "during his residence there, and saw with his own eyes that direct evidence which he had not supposed in existence. This evidence was found in some manuscript volumes kept in the Scotch College at Paris, and which

¹ "The dissolution of Charles the Second's last parliament," says Dalrymple, "in April of the year 1681, together with the general belief that he was never to summon another, produced various sentiments in the nation. The spirits of the Tories were raised, and those of the Whigs depressed; the former in proportion to their late fears, and the latter to their late hopes." * * * "Men of moderate sentiments were displeased with both parties; with the Whigs, because, in their zeal for liberty, they had refused the King's offer of limitations upon a popish successor; and with the Tories, because, in the excess of their loyalty, they rejoiced in the King's resolution to assemble parliaments no longer."—*Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 67. "Wherever the church and court party prevailed," says Hume, "addresses were framed, containing expressions of the highest regard to his majesty, the most entire acquiescence in his wisdom, the most

dutiful submission to his prerogative, and the deepest *abhorrence* of those who endeavored to encroach upon it, by prescribing to him any time for assembling the parliament. Thus the nation came to be distinguished into *petitioners* and *abhorrrers*. Factions indeed were at this time extremely animated against each other. The very names by which each party denominated its antagonists, discover the virulence and rancor which prevailed. For besides petitioner and abhorrer, appellations which were soon forgotten, this year is remarkable for being the epoch of the well-known epithets of "Whig" and "Tory."—*Hist. Eng.*, Vol. VI, p. 218.

² Read all—Hume, Burnet, Neal, Clarendon, Dalrymple, Harris, Macpherson, Voltaire, Hallam, Macaulay, Smyth, etc., and the subject of parties will be understood.

³ See *Hist. of England*, Vol. IV, p. 469.

Mr. Hume was permitted to peruse. These manuscript volumes were neither more nor less than a journal written by James the Second in his own hand, of his own life, during the most critical period of our history. From such a treasure as this, it is a matter to be lamented, and, indeed, deserving of extreme surprise, that such a historian as Hume did no more than produce a single extract."¹

Such surprise, however, may well be lessened when it is seen how little inclined Hume was to correct party errors. In the brief sketch of his own life, written the year of his death, 1776, he says,—“But though I had been taught by experience that the Whig party were in possession of bestowing all places, both in the state and in literature, I was so little inclined to yield to their senseless clamor, that in above a hundred alterations, which further study, reading, or reflection engaged me to make in the reigns of the two first Stuarts, I have made all of them invariably on the tory side.”²

The representatives of democracy, or “the patriotic leaders,” as they have been justly denominated,³ such as Sidney, Russell, Hampden, Hale, Jones, Temple, Marvell,⁴ and others, though too few in number to command success, were too patriotic to be either silent or idle. They were surrounded by enemies who hated them because they were honest, and by friends who were constant only when treachery ceased to be profitable. The tories had no occasion for such counsellors. Besides, honest men have no security when acting with dishonest associates. “It was the misfortune of the Whigs of this age,” says Cooke, “that they were obliged to act in concert with men whose violence, both in principles and in action, precipitated them often into imprudent, and sometimes into unjustifiable measures.” More than this, the popular cause was prejudiced by men who ignored party obligations. The desperadoes and fanatics who had been the tools of Shaftesbury, such as Rumsey, West, Ferguson, Holloway and

¹ Modern History, p. 307.

² History of England, Vol. I, p. 10.

³ “During the first period of their contest with the crown,” says Prof. Smyth, “the patriotic leaders must be considered as successful. The king, we may remember, broke the seals of his Declaration and gave way. But during this second period, the event was otherwise; the king could neither be persuaded nor intimidated into any compliance with the wishes of his opponents; and the struggle ended at length in the execution of some of their

leaders, and in the ruin of all.”—*Modern Hist.* p. 319.

⁴ Prof. Smyth thus speaks of “the patriot Andrew Marvell.” “Of this man it is well known,” he says, “that the treasurer Danby once made his way to his garret, and, under a proper disguise of courtly phraseology, offered him a bribe. It was refused; and this virtuous representative of the people, when he had turned away from the thousand pounds of the minister, was obliged to dine a second time on the dish of the former day, and borrow a guinea from his bookseller.”—*Modern Hist.*, p. 329.

Goodenough, became reckless when they lost their leader. When he was "obliged to leave England, the spell by which these spirits had been bound, was broken."¹ Numbers without integrity afford no strength to a political party, nor ever any real aid to government. Indeed, they multiply dangers by their schemes of iniquity, and by making promises they cannot redeem. They rely upon plots of danger, and cunning management. The Rye-house, and Popish² plots were striking illustrations of this truth.

In times of great political commotion, parties are liable to be imposed upon by plots of threatened danger devised by wicked men for party pur-

¹ *Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, pp. 225, 262.

² According to Rapin, the popish plot (1678) united in one conspiracy three particular designs: to kill the King, to subvert the government, and extirpate the Protestant religion. Lord Stafford was convicted as one of the conspirators, and beheaded—though he protested his innocence. In view of the excited condition of the people, Dalrymple thinks that the Earl of Shaftesbury "framed the fiction of the popish plot, in order to bury the Duke, and perhaps the King, under the weight of the national fear and hatred of popery. Shaftesbury was stimulated too, by offences both given and received. For the king having said to him, 'Shaftesbury, thou art the greatest rogue in the kingdom;' he answered bowing, 'Of a subject, Sir, I believe I am.' And the Duke having rated him in passionate terms for one of his speeches in parliament, 'I am glad,' said he, 'your Royal Highness has not called me also papist and coward.' Assuming that Shaftesbury was the author of the plot, a certain Lord in his confidence asked him, 'What he intended to do with the plot, which was so full of nonsense as would scarce go down with *tantum non* idiots; what then could he propose by pressing the belief of it upon men of common sense, and especially in parliament?' 'It is no matter,' said he, 'the more nonsensical the better; if we cannot bring them to swallow worse nonsense than that, we shall never do any good with them.'"—*Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 46. These statements do injustice to Shaftesbury. His keen irony was mistaken for confession. "He was violent

and ambitious," says Cooke, "but he was not corrupt. No statesman has been more unfairly treated by the writers of both parties; his want of political consistency lost him the favor of each; but none of his accusers have ever denied to Shaftesbury the character of being an incorruptible judge, and a man of honor." * * "As the father of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the originator of that measure which afterwards purified our corrupted courts of justice, by rendering the judges independent of the crown, he would alone deserve the gratitude of all generations of his countrymen."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, pp. 49, 129. M. Ruvigni, the Minister of Louis XIV.—was authorized to offer him ten thousand guineas, and the highest preferments, if he would serve him—but he was not influenced by the bribe. When Shaftesbury was led to the tower crowds of people followed him—saluting him with their prayers and good wishes. One of them cried out—"God bless your lordship! and deliver you from your enemies." He replied, with a smile, "I, my friend, have nothing to fear; rather pray to God to deliver them from me."—*Life of Shaftesbury*. Vol. II, p. 288. The "*Rye-House Plot*," was a pretended conspiracy to assassinate Charles the Second, and his brother the Duke of York (afterwards James II) at a place called Rye-House, on the way to London from Newmarket. Algernon Sidney suffered death on a false charge of being concerned in this conspiracy, Dec. 7, 1683.

poses. When the people are in a state of ignorance and frenzy,—they are easily frightened by tales of horror. Whether true or false, is a matter of but little inquiry. The most absurd fiction, for a time, may be as terrible as the most alarming truth. Writing under date of 1678, Hume says,—“The English nation, ever since the fatal league with France, had entertained violent jealousies against the court; and the subsequent measures adopted by the King had intended more to increase than cure the general prejudices. Some mysterious design was still suspected in every enterprise and profession; arbitrary power and Popery¹ were apprehended as the scope of all projects; each breath or rumor made the people start with anxiety; their enemies they thought, were in their very bosom, and had gotten possession of their sovereign’s confidence. While in this timorous, jealous disposition, the cry of *a plot* all on a sudden struck their ears; they were wakened from their slumber; and like men affrighted in the dark, took every figure for a spectre. The terror of each man became the source of terror to another. And a universal panic being diffused, reason and argument, and common sense and common humanity, lost all influence over them.” * * * “In all history, it will be difficult to find such another instance of popular frenzy and bigoted delusion.”² Macaulay says,—“Hundreds of thousands whom the Popish Plot had scared into Whiggism had been scared back by the Rye-House Plot into Toryism.”³ That the Popish Plot was connected with the name of Shaftesbury is sufficient evidence that it was designed to compromise political opponents. Sometimes a joke, too good to be discredited, is permitted to give currency to falsehood when it seems to help a sinking cause.

The democrats of the time were not permitted to act openly, and boldly, and they were tempted to place themselves in a false position that they might indirectly serve their country. They found, however, that the attainment of good cannot be aided by the fictions or contrivances of iniquity any more than the schemes of sin and depravity can be matured and advanced by the lofty motives of patriotism. The elements of good are indestructible in their nature and results. Evil is self-destructive, and yet its presence is made to disclose the great law by which goodness is made more beautiful.

It has been wisely said regarding this epoch, that “mankind are ever in extremes, their resistance or rebellion no sooner ceases and changes into

¹ In the House of Lords, on a Bill against Popery, a noble peer said,—“I would not have so much as a Popish man or a Popish woman to remain here; not so much as a Popish dog or a Popish bitch; not so much as a Popish cat to pur or mew about the king.”—*Hume*, Vol. VI, p. 187.

² History of England, Vol. VI, pp. 171, 186.

³ History of England, Vol. I, p. 448.

obedience than their obedience becomes servility.”¹ These changes comprehend the cause and effect of progress, and if carefully studied, the beautiful truth is seen to be demonstrated, as expressed by the poet, that

———“the first Almighty Cause
Acts not by partial, but by general laws.”

And, with the poet, the reader will be inspired reverently to ask,—

“Who knows, but *He* whose hand the lightning forms,
Who heaves old ocean, and who wings the storms;
Pours fierce ambition in a Cæsar’s mind,
Or turns young Ammon loose to scourge mankind?”²

“It is a characteristic of Providence,” says Sir John Dalrymple, “which human wisdom should not, however, attempt to imitate, to employ apparent evils for the attainment of real good, and to render dissension, as well as union, beneficial to mankind. The British nation has made its way through many dangers and troubles: The parties, by which it has been agitated, may have, each in its turn, run to extremes: But the result of the whole has been a constitution, which, by securing to all orders of men the rights of mankind, has never been equalled in any age or nation.”

* * * “If we suppose that Charles II. was serious in intending to bury the Protestant religion, the liberties of England, and the Dutch Commonwealth, in one grave, he may be considered as the most criminal of all English Princes. And, if we impute his indecisive and desultory measures, after he withdrew from the war, either to levity, or to the influence of the sums he received from foreigners, his conduct will appear in a very mean light. But, if his motives were really as criminal and mean as they are generally supposed to have been, the consequences of them afford one of the many instances in the English history, in which good has arisen to the English nation from intended evil.” * * * “This period is full of events great in themselves, and of all others the most interesting to Britons. It exhibits the insidious attempts of one Prince to destroy liberty, with the desperate boldness of the meanest of his subjects to take vengeance upon him for it, and the more generous struggles of a few of the greatest of them punished by an application of those laws which they meant to vindicate; the violent attempts of another against the rights of his people defeated by his dethronement in the midst of his prosperity; and the establishment of a third Prince, who, though shaken by factions,

¹ Prof. Smyth, *Modern History*, p. 801. the son of Jupiter Ammon: thence he is

² Alexander the Great was vainly styled called young Ammon.

and betrayed by false friendships, yet still generously protected that liberty which he had bestowed. Whatever can touch the heart, or rouse the spirit, is to be found in this period. The tender death of Lord Russell, the heroic one of Sidney; the favorite son of one King sent to the block by his successor, and human nature disgraced in the outrageous punishment of his followers; a great monarch seeking refuge from the ancient enemies of his kingdom; a nephew fighting against his uncle; two sons-in-law against their father; and two Kings contending in a disputed kingdom, as upon a public theatre, for pre-eminence; faction in England and Scotland, rebellion in Scotland and Ireland, and invasion impending upon all the three kingdoms; distractions in the Royal family; divisions among the great; terrors among the people; France enjoying and insulting the misfortunes she created, but sharing them in the end; and a gallant nation in continual agitations, not the symptoms of weakness, but of vigor, keeping its course straight forward to liberty and glory." * * * "Amidst this universal corruption of manners, the English nation was, for the first time, taught, that the abuse of laws may be worse than the want of them. But those of deeper reflection perceived, that an entire revolution of government alone could restore the political morals of the people." ¹

Thus, to answer the numerous inquiries of the historical student, Dalrymple reviews the events and grand results of centuries. He speaks of "a period, during which the laws were laid almost in ruins, in consequence of those very efforts which were made to preserve them; yet recovered all their honors, and established a system of freedom, which, after the struggles of six hundred years, was not rendered complete, until this great era of British liberty." In speaking of the historical importance of the Stuart papers, Prof. Smyth uses even stronger language. He recognizes *necessity* as an element of his philosophy. He says,—“These papers are still perfectly valuable, because they everywhere confirm the reasonings and justify the opinions that have been formed by historians and statesmen on the critical topics of these times, the corruption of Charles, the bigoted and arbitrary nature of James, and the necessity of the Revolution of 1688.” ² Necessity is a word of comprehensive import. As gravitation is to all matter, so is necessity to all divine laws. It is the condition of certainty. As here used by Prof. Smyth it not only implies the eternal order of cause and effect in human progress, but certainty in the ultimate triumphs of justice to the people of a nation. This subject will be further illustrated in future chapters.

Fully to comprehend the teachings of this period, it is necessary to look

¹ *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. 1, pp. 20, 42, 66, 71. ² *Modern History*, p. 311.

at the condition of Europe. To say more than a suggestive word would exceed the limits of this chapter, the design of which is only a brief survey of prevailing habits and opinions, and their general results. The greatness of Spain had rapidly declined, and other nations were either feeble, or ill-governed.¹ The great power of Europe was France, in the person of Louis XIV. He was a man of unlimited ambition and unscrupulous motives. He was able, cunning, handsome, dignified and accomplished. He was fully conscious of his own power and position, and aspired to universal empire. Like Charles, he was a sensualist, but unlike him he combined judgment with his wickedness. He was a dangerous monarch because he deliberately intended danger to others.² Successful negotiation with other powers, and his victorious war against Spain—sufficiently indicated the purposes of Louis,—and gave just alarm to the States General, and to England. By suggestion of Sir William Temple—an alliance was formed between England, the States General and Sweden, called the Triple Alliance. This measure was as vexatious to Louis as it was pleasing to England. The Cavalier felt that a dangerous Catholic neighbor had been checked, and the Roundhead rejoiced that England had united herself with a republican and Presbyterian people. “The House of Commons loudly applauded the treaty,” says Macaulay, “and some uncourtly grumblers described it as the only good thing that had been done since the King came in.”

The King did not participate in the general joy caused by this treaty. It promised much for the nation, too little for him. If he could enjoy hunting the moth, with his shameless companions, while the enemy were engaged in destroying his ships even in his own waters,—it could not be expected that he would give much thought to the subject of foreign alliances unless money was to be realized and made subject to his personal drafts. Besides, he was constantly engaged in plotting measures of a different nature, measures against not only the liberties of England, but the peace of Europe. He had not the bold policy of an irrepressible ambition, to

¹ See Hume, Vol. vi, p. 61.

² “No sovereign,” says Macaulay, “has ever represented the majesty of a great state with more dignity and grace. He was his own prime minister, and performed the duties of that arduous situation with an ability and an industry which could not be reasonably expected from one who had in infancy succeeded to a crown, and who had been surrounded by flatterers before he could speak. He had shown, in an eminent degree two talents, invaluable to a prince:

the talent of choosing his servants well, and the talent of appropriating to himself the chief part of the credit of their acts. In his dealings with foreign powers he had some generosity, but no justice.”—*Hist. of England*, Vol. i, p. 186. “His ambition,” says Hume, “regulated by prudence, not by justice, had carefully provided every means of conquest; and before he put himself in motion, he seemed to have absolutely insured success.”—*Hist. of England*, Vol. vi, p. 60.

gain power that he might exert it—to make for himself a name that would be the wonder of posterity, and the pride of his own subjects. No patriot could rebuke him without fear of personal indignity, loss of freedom, or of life.¹ An occasional minister opposed him frequently, but with what motives, it does not clearly appear. With no motive to become a benefactor to the world, in any sense, he did not even aspire to the distinction of infamous control. His ambition was selfish, mean, contemptible. He constantly wanted money that he might extend his pleasures, his debaucheries,—and it was a matter of utter indifference with him by what means it was acquired. He was ready to repudiate a debt, to falsify a treaty, to make war, to be a Papist or Protestant, to trade with Parliament, and even to sell his country to a foreign power—to realize money for his infamous purposes. Louis saw his weakness, and did not hesitate to enslave him, so far as he could do it by means of lewd women, or by pecuniary obligations.² It was evidently the design of Louis, if possible, to degrade

¹ When Sir John Coventry asked in the House of Commons, in answer to an observation that the players were the King's servants and a part of his pleasure, whether the King's pleasure lay among the men or women players, it is well known that Charles was so much enraged, that he caused the jester to be waylaid, and his nose slit with a penknife, to remind him of the danger of jesting with royalty.—*Burnet*, Vol. 1, p. 345.

² “In an evil hour for Charles II.,” says Dalrymple, “Clarendon had taught him, in the very first years of his reign, to receive money from France, unknown to his people.”—*Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 81. Not in the shape of loans to be repaid, but bribes, only to be cancelled by treason to the people. The two kings agreed to do nothing without the consent of each other; it was the wish of Louis to declare war against the Dutch; that Charles should declare himself a Catholic; that parliament should be convened, or prorogued according to his views and policy; that Charles should have the means to bribe his ministers or their wives, or to buy votes in or out of parliament, and that the English army should be increased, or disbanded, sent forward or withdrawn, as the interests of France should require. For money he

sold the political rights and dignity of the nation he had sworn to protect. In a letter dated January 9th, 1679, to Louis XIV., M. Barillon says,—“the King of England charged me to assure your Majesty he wished nothing so much as your friendship, and to make a strict union which nothing might alter; that he should have an extreme joy to owe his safety and preservation to you, and would not refuse any conditions your Majesty desired.” * * * “That he liked better to depend upon your Majesty than upon his people.”—*Ibid*, Vol. II, pp. 255–6. All these agreements were to be secret and held sacred. The reader will find in Dalrymple interesting accounts, though inaccurate as to the names of leading Whigs, of the large sums paid by Louis and received by Charles, and the names of persons who were made parties to the disgraceful negotiations. On December 2d, 1671, Colbert writes Louis,—“that Lady Arlington had in her husband's presence offered to accept of the present intended for her husband. The husband reproached her, but very obligingly.” On the 30th November, 1679, Barillon writes Louis, “that the Duchess of Portsmouth and Lord Sunderland hinted that they expected gratifications from France.”—“On the 1st and 21st January 1680, that the Duchess of Ports-

England to a mere dependency. Macaulay says, "His object was not to destroy our Constitution, but to keep the various elements of which it was composed in a perpetual state of conflict, and to set irreconcilable differences between those who had the power of the purse, and those who had the power of the sword. With this view he bribed and stimulated both parties in turn, pensioned at once the ministers of the crown and the chief of the Opposition, encouraged the court to withstand the seditious encroachments of the Parliament, and conveyed to the Parliament intimations of the arbitrary designs of the court." This opinion of Macaulay, limiting the motives of Louis is not warranted by the facts which he recites. He could not have done more if he had intended to destroy the British Constitution. He marked England for his prey and he did not leave her for a moment.

The demands of Charles upon the Commons were controlled in some degree for the public good. It was evidently his aim to establish a despotism, to substitute prerogative for constitution and law,—and the Commons fearing for its own independence consented to grants only upon concessions of the crown. The Commons had the prudent merit of fear, if they did not have the higher merit of wisdom. They would not trust the King with an army. It demanded war with France, but it did not have the courage to prosecute it when they saw that an army raised for one purpose by the Parliament might be easily diverted to another by the King. There was a general feeling of doubt and mistrust. The King feared no danger, except that of an empty treasury, but the Commons were in constant dread of treason from the King, of conflict with Louis, or of some horrid plot of the Papists. It was even proposed to take away the command of the militia from the King, thus indicating one of the usual absurdities of a revolutionary spirit,—of saving the constitution by violating it. It is true, the concessions of a dishonest and profligate ruler are no security to

mouth had said to him that Sunderland could not be secured to France without a good deal of money."—On the 19th February 1680—"Lord Sunderland and the Duchess of Portsmouth have received with very good grace the offers of gratification which I made them hope for." On the 1st of January 1680, Louis the XIV., wrote to Barillon "to offer 10,000 pistoles to Sunderland, and 5,000 to the Duchess of Portsmouth, with a promise of a renewal of these presents if they would keep Charles in the interests of France."—*Memoirs*, VOL. II, p. 391. In the same year he author-

ized Barillon to make assurances of protection to the nation—to the republican party in parliament.—*Ibid*, VOL. II, p. 341. "In Barillon's letters," says Dalrymple, "there are several relations of money sought by Buckingham and Montague, and sometimes given, but oftener refused to them. So far as I could discover in the papers at Versailles, Montague did not receive more than 50,000 of the 100,000 crowns promised him for ruining Lord Danby"—*Ibid*, VOL. II, p. 390. To make, or destroy character by hirelings, has been a political game of all ages of the world.

a people who have been deprived of a constitutional government. Still, so far as they go they show a surrender to Democracy. They strengthen the records of precedent in favor of principle, and ultimately serve the cause of freedom. Charles was bribed by Louis, and it is clearly proved that Parliament was bribed by Charles. He received large sums from Louis, and what was not necessary to seduce the Parliament, was used for himself.

These extraordinary proceedings of a monarch are attested by the highest authorities, and by authors whose prejudices would have been apt to conceal the facts if their notoriety had not rendered such an attempt utterly hopeless. In one thing, the King was consistently firm,—he was true to his brother. When he saw that the Constitution would aid him in frustrating an enemy, he was true to the laws. In a Providential sense, he was true on another occasion,—when he consented to the marriage of Mary to the Prince of Orange.¹ On the ground of Filmer, and by the aid of the clergy, he was doubtless strengthened in his mysterious convictions—that he held the crown by Divine right, and that God was good against the world, whatever his course might be. His reckless course, the rise and fall of his ministers, the changing policy and despair of Parliament, the doubtful struggles of party; the sacred Temple of Justice—profaned by the insolent lips of crime, and where innocence was made to weep and suffer; the suffering people—raised to the highest degree of loyal enthusiasm and then plunged into the deepest abyss of disaffection and dismay; the disappointment of pious men whose prayers were constant for a state of holiness, and of patriotic statesmen whose pride and integrity sought peace and the general good,—made up the atmosphere of this eventful period, and added another fearful proof that monarchy without

¹ This marriage was earnestly opposed by Louis, and it was regarded by him as in violation of promises made by Charles and the Duke of York. His fears were justified by succeeding events. In a letter to Louis, M. de Barillon gives an explanation in the King's own language. He said,—“I judge it very necessary for my interests, and I believe I shall draw considerable advantages from it now, and greater hereafter. This alliance will quiet the suspicions which my subjects have, that the alliance I preserve with France, hath no other foundation than a change of religion. It is my brother, the Duke of York's conduct, that has given rise to all these suspicions.” * * * “This is the rock against which I must

guard myself, and I assure you I need everything to enable me to resist the continual efforts of the whole English nation; for in fine, I am the only one of my party, except it be my brother. I am assured that the Prince of Orange's marriage with my niece will dissipate a part of these suspicions, and infinitely serve to show that I have no design which is not conformable to the established laws and religion of England.”—*Dalrymple's Memoirs*, VOL. II. p. 158.

It is interesting to see how unwittingly two royal brothers, intent upon tory rule, combined to depose their own family, and to secure a democratic successor to the throne of England.

democracy,—affords no permanent protection to a nation. To command confidence and respect; to insure progress and secure happiness,—no government can succeed but that which rests upon integrity, and is in harmony with the affections of the people. When Sir William Temple endeavored to embrace this great truth in his wise counsel to Charles the Second, he quoted the language of Gourville, a Frenchman, for whom he knew the King had entertained a great esteem. “A King of England,” said Gourville, “who will be *the man of his people*, is the greatest king in the world; but if he will be anything more, he will be nothing at all.” The king heard at first this discourse with some impatience; but being a dexterous dissembler, he seemed moved at last, and laying his hand on Temple’s, said, with an appearing cordiality, “And I will be the man of my people.”¹ But he was not. In a letter to Louis the XIVth, dated March 20, 1673, Mons. Colbert says,—the King of England “assured me that your Majesty’s sentiments had always more power over him than all the reasoning of his most faithful ministers.”²

The end of such a monarch was in fearful accord with his iniquitous life. He had long indulged in reckless mirth, but the time arrived when he could no longer be merry.³ In the condition of vigor, in the possession of earthly power, and the promise of age,—to use the significant language of Montaigne,—he had “been brave before God and a coward before man.” When he saw that death was near, and that earth to him was soon to be no more, he tremblingly removed the long disguise that had concealed his inward soul from his people, and confessed its convictions to human witnesses, that he could not enter into the presence of his God without correcting his record here, and without beginning another where deception could not avail him. The distinguished bishops whom so long he had deceived, and upon whom rested the sacred cause of religion in England, ceased to command his attention, and no longer controlled his will.⁴

¹ *Hume’s Hist. of England*, Vol. VI, p. 180.

² Dalrymple’s *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 115.

³ “Two years before his death,” says Prof. Smyth, “Charles came to the knowledge of all the French monarch’s proceedings: ‘he received,’ says Dalrymple, ‘a yet more mortifying stroke; he found that the court of France had been capable of intending (though the design was at last laid aside) to make public his secret negotiations with the Duchess of Orleans. What was the result? Conscious that he could be no longer loved by the intelligent part of

his subjects, that he was mistrusted and despised by every court in Europe, and that he had been all his life by the very prince to whom he had sold the immediate jewel of his soul, his secret chagrin became at length visible on his countenance, and for two years before his death, he had ceased to be the merry monarch who could laugh at the virtues and triumph in the vices of mankind.’”—*Modern History*, p. 380.

⁴ “The King was in great pain,” says Macaulay, “and complained that he felt as if a fire was burning within him; yet he bore up against his sufferings with a forti-

"Many attributed this apathy," says Macaulay, "to contempt for divine things, and many to the stupor which often precedes death; but there were in the palace a few persons who knew better. Charles had never been a sincere member of the Established Church. His mind had long oscillated between Hobbism and Popery. When his health was good and his spirits high, he was a scoffer. In his few serious moments he was a Roman Catholic."¹ As a Catholic he doubtless trembled for himself and them. He was eager to make his peace with heaven when he saw that his course of wickedness was to be ended on earth.

On the morning on which the King was taken ill, the Duchess of York had, at the request of the queen, suggested the propriety of procuring spiritual assistance. "For such assistance," says Macaulay, "Charles was at last indebted to an agency very different from that of his pious wife and sister-in-law. A life of frivolity and vice had not extinguished in the Duchess of Portsmouth all sentiments of religion, or all that kindness which is the glory of her sex."² The French ambassador, Barillon, who had come to the palace to inquire after the King, paid her a visit. He found her in an agony of sorrow. She took him into a secret room and poured out her whole heart to him. 'I have,' she said, 'a thing of great moment to tell you. If it were known, my head would be in danger. The King is really and truly a Catholic; but he will die without being reconciled to the Church. His bed-chamber is full of Protestant clergymen. I cannot enter it without giving scandal. The duke is thinking only of himself. Speak to him. Remind him that there is a soul at stake. He is master now. He can clear the room. Go this instant, or it will too late.'

tude which did not seem to belong to his soft and luxurious nature. The sight of his misery affected his wife so much that she fainted, and was carried senseless to her chamber. The prelates who were in waiting had from the first exhorted him to prepare for his end. They now thought it their duty to address him in a still more urgent manner. William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, an honest and pious, though narrow minded man, used great freedom. 'It is time,' he said, 'to speak out; for, sir, you are about to appear before a Judge who is no respecter of persons.' The King answered not a word. Thomas Ken, bishop of Bath and Wells, then tried his powers of persuasion." * * * "Of all the prelates the King liked Ken the best." He was eloquent in his exhortations but Charles was unmoved.

—*Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 403.

¹ *Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 404.

² At one time the Duchess was so unpopular among the people she could not appear in the street without the danger of being mobbed. It was not so with all the King's mistresses. Nell Gwynn's carriage being once mistaken for the Duchess of Portsmouth's, the crowd would have broken it to pieces; but she saved herself, and changed their groans into acclamations, by putting her head out of the window and crying out, "You are mistaken good folks; I am the Protestant w——." Hume says, "The King's favorite was Mrs. Palmer, afterwards created Duchess of Cleveland; a woman prodigal, rapacious, dissolute, violent, revengeful." She undermined Clarendon's credit with the King.

Barillon hastened to the bed-chamber, took the duke aside, and delivered the message of the mistress. The conscience of James smote him. He started as if roused from sleep, and declared that nothing should prevent him from discharging the sacred duty which had been so long delayed. He commanded the crowd to stand aloof, went to the bed, stooped down, and whispered something which none of the spectators could hear, but which they supposed to be some question about affairs of state. Charles answered in an audible voice,—‘Yes, yes, with all my heart.’ None of the bystanders, except the French ambassador, guessed that the King was declaring his wish to be admitted into the bosom of the Church of Rome. ‘Shall I bring a priest?’ said the duke. ‘Do, brother,’ replied the sick man. ‘For God’s sake do, and lose no time. But no; you will get into trouble.’ ‘If it costs me my life,’ said the duke, ‘I will fetch a priest.’” * * * “The duke’s orders were obeyed; and even the physicians withdrew. The back door was then opened and Father Huddleston entered. A cloak had been thrown over his sacred vestments, and his shaven crown was concealed by a flowing wig. ‘Sir’ said the duke, ‘this good man once saved your life. He now comes to save your soul.’”¹

Even his guilty companion in sin, with no fear of death for herself, but with a nominal piety that had existed in profession but not reduced to practice; with a solemn dread of death to one whose secrets she had known but whose acts had been in defiance of the teachings of her Holy Religion,—was suddenly seized with feelings of horror and despair,—when she saw that his spirit was about to return to God, associated with her own infamy, and without those indispensable guards and consolations of the Church—in which she believed, but which she had dishonored.

The announcement of the King’s death was received with painful consternation. A guilty King had died at the head of a wicked nation,—and party strife for a moment was hushed by the looks and language of superstitious awe. That such a King could die a peaceful death, and not by the hand of the assassin, seemed impossible. Rumor explained the death a thousand different ways, not one of which was true, and all of which were believed by some.²

¹ Hist. of England, Vol. I, pp. 405, 407.

² “At that time,” says Macaulay, “the common people throughout Europe, and no where more than in England, were in the habit of attributing the deaths of princes, especially when the prince was popular and the death unexpected, to the foulest and darkest kind of assassination.” After reviewing such rumors, from time to time, in England, Macaulay adds, “We cannot, therefore, wonder that wild stories without

number were repeated and believed by the common people. His majesty’s tongue had swelled to the size of a neat’s tongue. A cake of deleterious powder had been found in his brain. There were blue spots on his breast. There were black spots on his shoulder. Something had been put into his snuff box. Something had been put into his broth. Something had been put into his favorite dish of eggs and ambergris. The Duchess of Portsmouth had

The reign of Charles the Second is not only distinguished by the disgraceful and humiliating events of profligacy and corruption,—but the outlines of political parties were fully developed in all their definite and indefinite varieties. “Things were so entangled,” says Algernon Sidney, “that liberty of language was almost lost, and no man knew how to speak of anything lest he that was spoken unto might be of a party contrary to him, and that endeavored to overthrow what he would set up.”¹ “It was during this political chaos,” speaking of the same period, says Cooke, “that the party words, Whig and Tory, were struck out, and that definite titles were thus imposed upon principles and parties which had some time existed.” He commits a grave error, however, when he says,—“The latter part of the reign of Charles the Second, is an epoch whence we may date not only the rise of the Whig and Tory parties, but also the origin of the principles which they severally profess.” These parties, under different names, have always existed, and have been influenced by the same principles. Principles are eternal, and are in no way dependent either on the thoughts or acts of men, or of society. He shows a better judgment when he quotes with commendation the definitions of these two parties, given by Lord Bolingbroke. This eloquent writer, who cannot be accused of undue partiality for democracy, says,—

“The power and majesty of the people, an original contract, the authority and independency of parliaments, liberty, resistance, exclusion, abdication, deposition; these were ideas associated at that time, with the idea of a Whig, and supposed by every Whig to be incommunicable, and inconsistent with the idea of a Tory.

“Divine, hereditary, and indefeasible right, lineal succession, passive obedience, prerogative, non-resistance, slavery, nay, and sometimes Popery too, were associated in many minds to the idea of a Tory, and deemed incommunicable, and inconsistent in the same manner, with the idea of a Whig.”²

All political parties occasionally deviate from their standard of principle, but generally with questionable motives. When they submit to be influenced by considerations of expediency, they are careful to provide a way for a speedy return to their favorite theories, and not to interfere with those general tendencies, frequently without a name, and which are the natural results of their peculiar systems of influence and control. The

poisoned him in a cup of chocolate. The queen had poisoned him in a jar of dried pears. Such tales ought to be preserved, for they furnish us with a measure of the intelligence and virtue of the generation

which eagerly devoured them.”—*Hist. of England*, Vol. I, pp. 409, 410, 411.

¹ Letter to Farley.

² Dissertation on Parties, p. 5.

reign of Charles was the reign of the Tory party, subject only to these exceptions of expediency. This party is ever ready to seize with unscrupulous avidity whatever is available to perpetuate its devious course, and to accept from its opponents all apparent aids however uncertain, or however absurd. Though democracy is regarded by the Tories with professed abhorrence, yet, they do not hesitate to appeal to the people with a show of popular zeal as if they believed them to be the source of all power, and that equality and toryism are synonymous terms.

When the King of France had conclusive evidence that the King and Court of England, the Tory party, aided by his money, and by his plotting ministers and seductive women—were altogether unable to control political events according to his ambitious purposes, he did not hesitate to approach both democrats and republicans with assurances of party neutrality and popular sympathy. Barillon, Rouvigny, Colbert, Courtin, the Duchess of Orleans—lost no opportunity in pointing out to their royal master the strong men of England, the democratic leaders of the people. They had no conceptions of party character above the artful intrigues of political cabals. It was a redeeming feature of their judgment, however, that they recognized integrity as the most important element of moral strength. In a letter to Louis, dated Dec. 14, 1679, Barillon writes,—“I have at all times taken great care to manage Lord Holles, and I believe I have kept him in very favorable sentiments for your majesty’s interests. He is the man of all England for whom the different cabals have the most consideration. He is respected by all parties, but principally by the Presbyterians. Nothing did me so much service with him as the offer I made him on your majesty’s part of a box with your picture set with diamonds.”¹ It is difficult to say what this service could be, when he admits that although he pressed him many times “to accept the box,” he always excused himself. He wanted no jewelled corruption about his person.² In the same letter he speaks of Lyttleton as “one of the most considerable in the House of Commons,” and of Powle, as a man “fit to fill one of the first posts of England, very eloquent and very able.” Also, of Sidney “as a man who was in the first wars, and who is naturally an enemy to the court,” and “that he had always appeared to have the same sentiments, and not to have changed maxims.” When he attempts to prove Sidney capable of being useful to France at the expense of England, however, he undertakes a difficult task.

¹ Dalrymple’s *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 319.

² In the same letter, Barillon says, — “If your Majesty thinks I ought again to press Lord Holles to accept the box of diamonds, I may by means of Lady Holles

make him accept it; I don’t presume she will be so difficult as he has been.” The box was afterwards given to Lord St. Albans.—*Dalrymple*, Vol. II, pp. 322, 323.

"Every one," says Cooke, "who is at all conversant with the principal events of Sidney's life, or has read any part of his correspondence,¹ must at once see that such conduct as this is the most inconsistent with his general character of any that could be attributed to him." In his letter to Louis, Barillon says, "Mr. Sidney has been of great service to me on many occasions." * * * "I gave him only what your Majesty permitted me. He would willingly have had more, and if a new gratification was given him, it would be easy to engage him entirely."²

In defence of Sidney and others against these charges, Cooke says,— "the question becomes one of credit between Barillon and the leaders of the Whig party." In speaking of Sidney, Barillon furnishes evidence against his own assertions. He testifies to his great force and openness of character, and in one of his dispatches to Louis, Sept. 1680, says, "it appears that Mr. Sidney's public objects in these intrigues were a republic, and the most unlimited toleration of religion."³ Again, in a letter, Dec. 5th, he speaks of him as "a man of great views and very high designs, which tend to the establishment of a republic."⁴ These opinions of Sidney prevailed wherever he was known, and they are utterly inconsistent with

¹ When his father gave him hopes of return from exile, Sidney said, in reply, "I confess, we are naturally inclined to delight in our own country, and I have a particular love for mine. I hope I have given some testimony of it. I think that being exiled from it is a great evil, and would redeem myself from it with the loss of a great deal of my blood. But when that country of mine, which used to be esteemed a paradise, is now like to be made a stage of injury; the liberty which we hoped to establish oppressed; luxury and lewdness set up in its height; the best of our nation made a prey to the worst; the parliament, court, and army corrupted; the people enslaved; all things vendible; no man safe but by such evil and infamous means as flattery and bribery; what joy can I have in my own country in this condition? Is it a pleasure to see all that I love in the world is sold and destroyed? Shall I renounce all my old principles, learn the vile court arts, and make my peace by bribing some of them. Shall their corruption and vice be my safety? Ah, no! better is a life among strangers, than in my own country upon such conditions. Whilst I live I will

endeavor to preserve my liberty, or at least not consent to the destroying of it. I hope I shall die in the same principles in which I have lived, and will live no longer than they can preserve me. I have in my life been guilty of many follies, but, I think, of no meanness. I will not blot and defile that which is past, by endeavoring to provide for the future. I have ever had in my mind, that when God should cast me into such a condition, as that I cannot save my life but by doing an indecent thing, he shows me the time is come when I should resign it." And, again, "It is usual to destroy those that will not be corrupted: I could expect no less. Whatsoever my fortune is, I hope I shall show unto your lordship that I am not capable of base compliance with fortune, in relation to any person whatever, nor an indecent action, and before I swerve from this rule I hope God will put an end unto my life."—*Blen-cow's Sidney Papers*, p. 223. *Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 126.

² The sum given him, it was asserted, was 1000 guineas.

³ Dalrymple, Vol. II, pp. 351, 382.

⁴ Dalrymple, Vol. II, pp. 351, 382.

any supposition that he would be likely to accept bribes from Tories to aid him in his schemes of republicanism which they detested. For these opinions, always boldly expressed, he was banished. Although Charles, at an early period, was indebted to him for his life, and called him "a man of principle and judgment, yet, he counted him a dangerous political enemy." In a letter to Louis, dated Aug. 4, 1670, Colbert says,—“The King (Charles) said to me again, that he did not care whether Sidney lived in Paris, Languedoc, or any other place he pleased, provided he did not return to England, where, said he, his pernicious sentiments, supported with so great parts and courage, might do much hurt.” And later,—“that it was proper to let him return to Languedoc, and that he could not be too far from England.”¹ In a letter to the Prince of Orange, dated Dec. 4, 1683, the Duke of York says,—“As for news here, Algernon Sidney is to be beheaded on Friday next on the Tower-hill, which besides the doing justice on so ill a man, will give the lie to the Whigs, who reported he was not to suffer.”² In another to the same, Dec. 7th, he writes, “Algernon Sidney was beheaded this day, died very resolutely, and like a true rebel and republican.”³ If he had been false to the Whigs by serving the Tories, where is the evidence of their complaint and indignation at his treachery to their cause? If he served the Tories with great acceptance, as Barillon asserts, where is the evidence of their denunciations of his ingratitude for their pecuniary favors, and why did they take his life? These questions are sufficiently answered by the logic of probabilities without corroborative testimony. Government emissaries are generally inclined to destroy what they cannot master. The exculpatory suggestion of Hallam, “that the opposition agreed together to receive these gifts from France rather than offend their new ally, or excite any suspicion of their sincerity,” increases the difficulty. For in what way could they be sincere without giving offence, or, how could Louis be an ally to England except to traitors? When Barillon included in his debasing catalogue such names as Hampden, Russell, Lyttleton, Holles, Powle and Sidney, his credibility must be examined by his own standard of principle. He was the paid agent of a dishonest monarch, and his success depended upon skilful deception. If he could not compromise patriotic opponents the least he could do for the cause of his master would be to misrepresent them. The acknowledged motives of men determine their standing and character. What more enduring monument to democracy than the character of Russell? It rose above the power of the strongest monarch in the world, the persuasive tongue of enchanting woman, and it could not be moved by the potent force

¹ Dalrymple, *Ves. II*, Appendix, p. 75.

² *Ibid.*, p. 66.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

of money. If this influence swayed its enemies, what ought to be its influence, when truly honored by its friends? When Lord Russell had been convicted of high treason by a packed jury and condemned to the block,¹ great efforts were made to induce him publicly to acknowledge the doctrine of non-resistance. This he modestly but firmly refused to do. When Lord Dartmouth, a most devoted tory, begged for his life, and dwelt upon his exalted character, his known virtues and extensive popularity, the King replied,—“All that is very true, but it is equally true that if I do not take his life he will have mine.”² The favorite mistress of the King was made the medium of an offer from his father, the Duke of Bedford, of £100,000 for the life of Russell. In his answer he committed a double crime—by joining an evasion of sacred duty with false professions of democracy. “I will not,” said he, “sell my own and my people’s blood at such a price.” When Barillon told him that Louis had written to him a letter asking the life of Russell, and that the younger Rouvigny was on his way to deliver it, the King replied, “I do not wish to prevent Monsieur Rouvigny from coming here, but my Lord Russell’s head will be off before he arrives.”

But the greatest effrontery of the Tory party, from the crowned heads of Louis and Charles to the humblest of their followers,—is to be found in its shameless dissimulation. In Barillon’s letter to Louis, from which quotations have already been made, he speaks boldly to Lord Holles of the patriotic motives of Louis. He says, “I have told him (Holles) in general that your Majesty will never enter into any engagement with his Britannic Majesty which might be prejudicial to the liberties and privileges of the English.”³ In 1679, he wrote him, “that the power of Charles by the factions of his dominions is entirely sunk,” and “that it is better to continue to court the heads of parties in order to continue his difficulties.”⁴ “While Louis was endeavoring to raise commotions,” says Dalrymple, “by means of the Duke of York, dreading the session of a new parliament, he gave orders to Barillon, Nov. 15, 1680, before it met, to tempt the King with a money treaty, on the one hand, and to intrigue with the popular party on the other.”⁵ In the same letter he ordered Barillon “to encourage the Duke of York to make a stand in Scotland, to assure the republican party in parliament, that he would protect the privileges of the nation.” On the 23d, he writes “to encourage Charles to follow a firm and bold conduct to his subjects in his present situation.” On Dec. 13th, he expresses “his satisfaction

¹ “There is no doubt whatever,” says just penalties due to treason. He deemed the execution of Russell a triumph over the Whigs, Cooke, “that this jury was packed by North under the direction of Buxton and Graham, solicitors for the crown.”

² Dalrymple, Vol. II, p. 224.

³ The King did not fear violence. He feared the triumph of the Whig party—the

⁴ Ibid, p. 258.

⁵ Ibid, p. 241.

at the divisions in England, and orders him to assure the republican party that it is not his intention to suffer their liberties to be hurt." Other despatches followed, showing—"in a strong light," says Dalrymple, "the distracted state of the kingdom, and that versatility of politics by which Louis the XIVth, accommodating his conduct to the variation of circumstances, played at that time the king and parliament against each other, deceiving both separately, while he pretended to be a friend to both separately."¹

To have a clear idea of tory principles as developed by the events in the reign of Charles the Second, it is necessary to read the parliamentary discussions on the Indemnity Act, the Exclusion Bill, the Test Act, the Rights of Petition, and the Freedom of London,—the party Declarations of the University of Cambridge, the proceedings of the London Grand Jury respecting Lord Shaftesbury,—and the enunciation of Toryism,—an extraordinary document issued by the University of Oxford, entitled—"*The Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, July 21, 1683, against certain pernicious books and damnable doctrines destructive to the sacred persons of princes, their state and government, and of all human society.*"

While the Commons were discussing the question—May 17, 1675—"That no Bill be brought in or received, but such as are already ordered to be brought in, or shall be sent down from the Lords, until after the recess mentioned in his majesty's speech," the famous Non-Resisting Test Act was introduced into the House of Lords. This Bill was entitled "An Act to prevent the Dangers which may arise from Persons disaffected to the Government."² "The grand push," says Ralph, "was made in the House of Lords, to disarm disaffection and republicanism, according to the royalists; or, according to the patriots, to extinguish the last spark of English liberty. The expedient which was to facilitate this mighty event, and which was the joint product of all the subtilty that the schools, the bar, the court, could furnish, was contained in an oath which was prescribed." By this Bill, all members of the legislature, and all who held any public office, whether civil, military, or ecclesiastical, were obliged, under a penalty of £500, to take an extraordinary oath, which had already been enjoined, in a modified form, by an act passed while the Commons were yet eager in their loyalty. This oath consisted of a declaration, that it was not lawful, upon any pretence whatever, to take up arms against the King; and that the

¹ Dalrymple, Vol. II, p. 341.

² After the session a Pamphlet was published, by John Locke, entitled—"A Letter from a person of quality to his friend in the country, giving an account of the Debates and Resolutions in the House of Lords, in

April and May, 1675, concerning a bill entitled, 'An Act, etc.,' as given in the text." The document may be found Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, No. V of the Appendix.

person taking it abhorred that traitorous position of taking arms, by his authority, against his person, or against those commissioned by him, in pursuance of any commission; and that he would not, at any time, endeavor the alteration of government, either in church or state.¹

"The Earl of Danby," says Cooke, "was the minister who originated this infamous attempt to render the dogma of passive obedience a part of the English Constitution, and to fetter even the members of the legislature. The freedom of debate was, indeed, reserved, but the ministry did not hesitate to avow that it was their intention to restrain them from speaking or writing upon affairs of state without the walls of their several houses. This Bill passed the House of Lords, and but for the energy and ingenuity of Shaftesbury it would have passed the Commons."²

Hampden was not alone in the opinion that the Exclusion Bill³ was not a religious test, but purely a political question between the Whigs and Tories. Party lines were deeply drawn from the narrow confines of arbitrary power to the wide range of democratic freedom. The Whigs rested their cause with man in his strength, as influenced by God, the Tories rested theirs with God as influenced by man in his weakness. In the House of Com-

¹ *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV, p. 714. *History of Party*, VOL. I, p. 28.

² *Ibid*, p. 24.

³ On the 15th of May, 1679, this important bill was brought into the House of Commons, and read a first time. After detailing the particulars of the Popish plot it set forth, "That the emissaries, priests, and agents of the Pope, had traitorously seduced James, Duke of York, presumptive heir to these crowns, to the communion to the church of Rome, and had induced him to enter into several negotiations with the Pope, his cardinals, nuncios, for promoting the Romish Church and interest; and by this means and procurement had advanced the power and greatness of the French King to the manifest hazard of these Kingdoms. That by descent of these crowns upon a Papist, and by foreign alliances and assistance, they might be able to succeed in their wicked and villainous designs." After further preamble, the bill proceeded to enact:—

I. "That the said James, Duke of York, should be incapable of inheriting the crowns of England, Scotland, and Ireland, with their dependencies; and of enjoying any of the

titles, rights, prerogatives and revenues belonging to the said crowns.

II. "That in case his Majesty should happen to die, or resign his dominions, they should devolve to the person next in succession in the same manner as if the duke was dead.

III. "That all acts of sovereignty and royalty that prince might then happen to perform, were not only to be declared void, but to be high treason, and punishable as such.

IV. "That if any one, at any time whatsoever, should endeavor to bring the said duke into any of the forementioned dominions, or correspond with him, in order to make him inherit, he should be guilty of high treason.

V. "That if the duke himself ever returned into any of these dominions, considering the mischief that must ensue, he should be looked upon as guilty of the same offence; and all persons were authorized and required to seize upon and imprison him; and, in case of resistance made by him or his adherents, to subdue them by force of arms."—See *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. IV. *Hist. of Party*, VOL. I, p. 92.

mons, Oct. 1680, Col. Birch made a forcible speech upon this Bill, from which the following is an extract:—"Our legislative power is unbounded, and we may offer to the lords, and so to his majesty, what Bills we think good. And it can as little be doubted, that the legislative power of the nation, King, Lords, and Commons, should want a law to make laws; or that any laws should be against what laws they make; otherwise they cannot be legally opposed." * * * "We may as well think of catching a lion with a mouse-trap, as to secure ourselves against Popery without the Exclusion Bill."¹ The Bill was defended by Col. Titus, Lord Russell, Sir Henry Capel, John Hampden, Sir Wm. Pulteny, and others. It was earnestly opposed by the Tories as a matter of course. Sir Leoline Jenkins considered the Bill as "coptrary to natural justice," making it a personal question to the Duke of York, and moved "to throw it out." He did not attempt to disguise the Tory theory of government, nor to conceal his fears of democracy. He said,—“I am of opinion, that the Kings of England have their right from God alone; and that no power on earth can deprive them of it. And I hope that this house will not attempt to do anything, which is so precisely contrary, not only to the law of God, but the law of the land too. For if this Bill should pass, it would change the essence of the monarchy, and make the crown elective.”² In speaking of Jenkins, Dr. Burnet says,—“he was set on every punctilio of the Church of England to superstition, and was a great assertor of the Divine Right of monarchy, and was for carrying the Prerogative high. All his speeches and arguments against the Exclusion were heard with indignation.” The Bill was rapidly passed by the Commons, but rejected by the House of Lords by a vote of sixty-three to thirty. The debate was so interesting that the Commons adjourned their house to be present at it, and so important, that the King remained the whole day in the house to discountenance its advocates, and to give confidence to its opponents.³ To prevent the passage of the bill—the King sent a message giving assurances “that all remedies they could tender him against Popery would be acceptable to him, provided they were such as might consist with preserving the succession of the crown in all its legal course of descent.” It is probable that he would at this time have submitted to any limitations or restrictions—to anything but absolute exclusion.⁴ Although the bill did not become a law, time soon demonstrated that the apprehensions of danger expressed by the Whigs—were not without just foundations. But Tory success is temporary, only nominal. The halcyon days of the party are in the deceptive promises of the future—which are never redeemed. The present does not

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, p. 1132.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, p. 1190.

³ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 153.

⁴ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 154.

satisfy. When the power of Charles had become nearly absolute, (1681) the Tories said, "Now we begin to have a prospect of halcyon days."¹ To keep alive the peculiar spirit of loyalty which he imagined he saw, and which was so necessary to his fictitious courage,—the King published a declaration of his reasons for dissolving his two last parliaments, and attempted to defend his usurpations. "After reckoning up all the points of opposition," says Cooke, "in which he had been foiled by the vigilance of the Commons, he, however, concludes by assuring his people with deliberate falsehood, 'that nothing should ever alter his affection to the Protestant religion as established by law, nor his love to parliaments, for he would still have frequent parliaments.'"² This declaration was ably answered by the joint labors of Algernon Sidney, Sir Wm. Jones, and Mr. (afterwards Lord) Somers, which answer was pronounced by Ralph as the most judicious and important document ever put forth by the Whig party.³

The attempt to influence the Grand Jury to find a Bill against Lord Shaftesbury, for high treason, was an interesting party struggle, and it ended in a democratic victory.⁴ When the indictment was returned by the jury indorsed "*Ignoramus*,"⁵ the announcement was received by the people, who "thronged all the avenues to the court," with bursts of applause. "The acclamations," says Cooke, "were caught up outside, and for an hour the air rang with plaudits of the assembled multitude. The citizens indulged in excess of joy, and as it grew dark, bonfires throughout and around the city notified the escape of the destined victim, and the triumph of the people." The event was commemorated by a medal, bearing the bust and title of Shaftesbury, and on the reverse, a sun obscured by a cloud rising over the tower and city of London, the date of the reception of the bill, and the motto, "*LÆTAMUR*." This medal was skilfully prepared and multiplied by an artist, and became for a time the party badge of the Whigs throughout the kingdom. The notorious fact that there was no evidence whatever to convict Shaftesbury of being the author of a treasonable paper, organizing an association to resist the accession of a Popish King, rendered the Tories desperate. Addresses to the king were made by the University of Cambridge, of the Inner Temple, the

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. 1, p. 192.

² Ibid, Vol. 1, p. 192.

³ It is printed in Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, in the Appendix, p. cxxxiv.

⁴ On the 24th of November, the grand jury returned by the Whig Sheriff, but consisting of some of the most eminent merchants and citizens of London, took this bill into consideration. The preparations

made, and the concourse of people assembled, sufficiently marked this trial to be an important party struggle. See Hist. of Party, Vol. 1, p. 212.

⁵ "We are ignorant." This is the term used when the Grand Jury reject the evidence as too weak to make good the indictment.

Middle Temple, and by others,—urging him “to proceed to remove all those obstructions which have or may prevent the bringing of disaffected and evil men to suffer that exemplary justice they have most notoriously deserved.” The language of some of these addresses was so servile and insolent that they were disowned by many of the most respectable of the Tory party. Sidney spoke of them “as mere noise, signifying nothing.” Burnet says,—“they were generally believed to be penned by the clergy, among whom the duke’s health was always drunk with shouts and hurrahs, to which another health—‘To the confusion of his enemies,’ was commonly added.”

It is an interesting fact that most of the large cities of free countries are democratic. This has been true of England. The King looked upon such cities as dangerous to his rule, and his party counsellors were quite ready to favor any process for their reduction that promised success. London was too great a power to be left to its freedom, when that power was made manifest in promoting the noble spirit of democracy. The Tory attack upon the liberties of this great city is admirably given by Cooke,¹ from which the following extracts are made:—“The city of London hath hitherto stood firm and unassailable, high above the reach of the flood of royal wrath which swept around it and overbore every meaner barrier; but now this last stronghold of liberty was to be destroyed.” * * * “Charles usually had recourse to his lawyers for some plausible disguise for a projected injustice. Upon this occasion they were not wanting either in zeal or ingenuity. Sanders, the most profound lawyer and the most profligate man at the bar, was the author of a new doctrine of law, that the slightest irregularity in the proceedings of a corporation worked a forfeiture of their charter.” * * * “During the contests between the petitioners and abhorrrers, the city had presented a strong petition² for the meeting of parliament, and they had imposed a trifling tax upon sellers resorting to the public markets, in order to defray the debt they had incurred in rebuilding them after the fire. These were the two delinquencies charged upon the

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 223.

² This petition is printed in the Somers’ Tracts, Vol. VIII, p. 144.

When the plague raged in London and Westminster, in 1665, the fifth session of the Second Parliament was held at Oxford. In 1680, when Parliament was engaged in passing resolutions severely condemning the unlawful course of the King, and were suddenly summoned by the usher of the black-rod to hear “their sentence of prorogation, the city of London was the first to

take the alarm.” A petition was presented to his majesty reciting the important questions still pending before parliament, and praying that its session may be continued till they had acted upon all the great affairs before them. To this petition the King gave answer,—“It was none of their business.” In less than a week, Jan. 18, 1680—he issued a proclamation dissolving parliament, and summoned a new one to meet at Oxford on the 21st of March.

city." * * * "The authorities of the city were accordingly served with a writ of *quo warranto*—a process which required them to appear before the court of the King's Bench, and show by *what authority* they exercised the functions of the offices they claimed to hold. More than a year was consumed after the preliminary proceedings. When the case grew ripe for argument, the king found it necessary to make some alterations in the bench of judges by whom it was to be tried." Honest judges were dismissed, and obedient ones appointed to fill their places. "The preliminaries being thus adjusted, and the bench judiciously packed, early in 1683 the case came on for argument. Finch and Sawyer on behalf of the crown, conducted the contest with an ingenuity which all lawyers admire; but Treby and Pollexfen in reply, adduced argument and authority by which none but a corrupted tribunal could fail to be convinced. On the 12th of June the court were assembled to give judgment, which was pronounced. It was, that a corporation aggregate might be seized; that the tax levied by virtue of the by-law was extortion, and a forfeiture of the franchise of being a corporation; that the petition was scandalous and libellous, and the making it and publishing it a forfeiture; that the act of the common council was the act of the corporation; that no cause had been shown to excuse or avoid these forfeitures; that therefore the information had been well founded; and therefore that the franchise should be seized into the King's hands." * * * "Thus fell the privileges of the city of London. The entry of the judgment was, upon the motion of the attorney general, respited until the king's pleasure should be known." * * * "Charles was contented to await the submission, which he doubted not this exhibition of his power would produce." He was not disappointed. He made his conditions known, and as the people could not resist—they were unconditionally accepted. So long as the king's life was spared—he could pack the London and Middlesex juries with the same facility as he could those of the other parts of his kingdom. As this is a most important chapter in the history of party—the reader will be amply compensated by persuing the entire account from which these brief outlines are made.

Before dismissing the subject of the reign of this monarch, particular attention is asked to an extraordinary fact which should not be omitted in any sketch of this period. On the day that Russell suffered death, the University of Oxford published, what was equivalent to a formal renunciation of the liberties of England. It is a decree which is a negative assertion of the principles of party. This enunciation of Toryism, from so high authority, is too important a document to be forgotten, and it is placed at length in the Appendix.¹ Oxford was the great stronghold of Toryism. That

¹See APPENDIX, D.

educated intellect and the preachers of Christianity should favor arbitrary power is a subject yet to be explained.

It has been seen that the life of Charles was no honor to royalty, and of no direct benefit to the nation. With this lesson in view, let the inquiry be extended to his successor, James the Second.

JAMES THE SECOND.

In some respects it was a privilege to be the immediate successor of Charles the Second. He did but little to give peace and security to his people, but much to dishonor and to humble their pride. If he left no examples worthy to be followed, it is certain that no one could be at a loss as to what examples should be avoided. It was easy to excel his virtues even if it was difficult to avoid his vices. There was nothing in his record calculated to stimulate a commendable ambition, nothing to excite envy, or to challenge capacity. He discovered no love of principle to give confidence to patriotism, nor of integrity to warrant hopes of success. He was indifferent to pride and common decency. It is a charitable aphorism of Joubert that, "In good times we are better than ourselves; in bad times, worse." If it be permitted that Charles should share the benefit of so benevolent a sentiment, it cannot be denied that James is entitled, in some degree to share it with him. "Austerities and mortifications are means by which the mind is invigorated and roused," says Dr. Johnson, "by which the attractions of pleasure are interrupted, and the chains of sensuality are broken." To use such means implies a proper sense of duty. The different characters of the two brothers were well and wittily described by Buckingham, when he said "that Charles could see things rightly if he would, and James would if he could."¹ James enjoyed the benefits of leisure and opportunity to observe and study the conduct of Charles. He knew of his crimes and heard them denounced, and of his errors and heard them lamented. To suppose that he himself did not condemn them is to suppose him incapable of honest judgment. And yet, in his first speech to his privy-council, he said, "Since it hath pleased Almighty God to place me in this station, and I am now to succeed so gracious a King, as well as so kind a brother, I think it fit to declare to you, that I will endeavor to follow his example, and most especially in that of his great clemency and tenderness to his people."² It was a time to prepare the plough, if not to turn up the ground. It could not be supposed that he was utterly indifferent to fame, or ignorant of the means to secure it. Much less, could it be supposed that one who was entitled to the crown would prepare for himself

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 11.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. IV, p. 1342.

so unenviable a place in history as that marked by Hesiod, in his celebrated distribution of mankind. He divides them into three orders of intellect, and James would be placed in the third—if anywhere. “The first place,” says he, “belongs to him that can by his own powers, discern what is right and fit, and penetrate to the remoter motives of action. The second is claimed by him that is willing to bear instruction, and can perceive right and wrong when they are shown him by another; but he that has neither acuteness nor docility, who can neither find the way by himself nor will be led by others, is a wretch without use or value.” Besides, James was well aware of the prevailing doubts respecting his own character and opinions, and he had a double motive not only to avoid the errors of his brother—but to see that he committed none himself. He ascended the throne with high professions of duty, and promised all that could be asked.¹ His assurances were accepted in good faith, and it was a subject of general congratulation that if the nation had been cursed by Charles it was about to be blessed by James. The peaceful Quakers were moved to manifest their respect for him, and to ask for themselves, as dissenters, the same respect and protection that he, as a papist, would have to ask for himself.² He claimed no prerogative above law, he asserted no spiritual control above that of the Protestant Church. He disclaimed all disposition to favor arbitrary rule, and was quite content to be satisfied with the glory of being king.³ It

¹ In his first speech to his council he said, “I have been reported to be a man for arbitrary power, but that is not the only story that has been made of me; and I shall make it my endeavor to preserve this government both in Church and State, as it is now by law established.” * * * “I know too, that the laws of England are sufficient to make the King as great a monarch as I can wish; and as I shall never depart from the just right and prerogative of the crown, so I shall never invade any man’s property.”—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. IV, p. 1842.

² Macaulay says “The first use which William Penn made of his credit (at the Court of James) was highly commendable. He strongly represented the sufferings of the Quakers to the new King, who saw with pleasure that it was possible to grant indulgence to these quiet sectaries and to the Roman Catholics without showing similar favor to other classes which were then under persecution. A list was framed

of persons against whom proceedings had been instituted for not taking the oaths, or for not going to church, and of those whose loyalty certificates had been produced to the government. These persons were discharged, and orders were given that no similar proceeding should be instituted till the royal pleasure should be further signified. In this way about fifteen hundred Quakers, and a still greater number of Roman Catholics, regained their liberty.”—*Hist. of Eng.*, Vol. I, p. 472.

³ This speech was loyally published throughout the nation. The Tories received the assurance with unbounded confidence. “We have now the word of a King, and a word never yet broken,” was the commentary which proceeded from every pulpit. Loyal addresses immediately surrounded the throne. Oxford, true to her declaration, promised obedience without limitations or restrictions. The clergy of London, on the other hand, consistently with the principles still fastened in the metropolis, covertly

was natural that he should remember the Exclusionists, and to indulge in a triumph of possession, if not in religious freedom. It was not to be expected, however, that his pride would permit him to verify their predictions by perfidy, even if his passions led him to seek to be revenged for their indignities. It was no time for resentment.¹ If ever, it was a time for solemn duty. What they had demanded had been conceded, and confirmed by Parliament, and if he was capable of appreciating liberty as a Papist how could he be indifferent to the same privilege to a Protestant? It was not so much what he desired for himself, as an individual, as what was demanded by the nation, for the people of the nation. Their bodies were his subjects, not their souls. He was a magistrate to enforce due obedience to constitutional law, and not to enslave their consciences. Was he honest? Was he capable? Had he been educated, and placed in relation to the high responsibilities of knowledge? Had he been taught the meaning of an oath—to be true to God and true to man? Was he a friend to religion, and to its institutions, to the government, and to the British Constitution? In these questions it is not designed to ask to what party he belonged, nor to what Church. All parties can boast of honest men, all sects of pious men, and all classes—of wise men. Their purpose is to reach a standard of analysis that will enable the reader to judge of monarchy by itself—disconnected from democracy. To see what national good, or evil—can be traced to either, or to both. Charles the First lost his kingdom and his head. Cromwell gave birth to the Commonwealth, but could not save it. Charles the Second restored the crown to royalty,—but disgraced it. It passed into the hands of James, and the inquiry is still pertinent,—what were the true elements of his character, and what did he accomplish for the nation, as king? If the nation prospered, was its prosperity to be traced to royalty, or democracy? If it suffered

insinuated their distrust and determination, by speaking of “their religion established by law dearer to them than their lives.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 874.

¹ When gratified and unopposed, James was not implacable as may be seen in the choice of a ministry. Halifax, the trimmer, as he was now generally called, had been, a few days before, the triumphant rival of James's, faithful adherent, the Earl of Rochester. Godolphin had taken part with him, Sunderland had promoted the Exclusion. These three ministers, therefore, thought themselves destined to feel the first effects of the new sovereign's power. Halifax, in the expectation of the storm,

sought a private interview, and attempted to excuse his conduct. The king, however, who had no design to create unnecessary opposition, stopped him, declaring that he would remember nothing but his behaviour upon the Exclusion Bill. The offences of Sunderland were more serious; but that veteran of intrigue, who had so often saved himself in the former reign by the influence of the Duchess of Portsmouth, had not neglected to secure himself a patroness in this. Lord Godolphin was included in the general amnesty, as Sir James M'Intosh thinks, “was retained only from his habits of business.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, pp. 865, 877.

from misrule, what party was responsible for it? Man, in public position, is to be counted a power, either for good or evil, as connected with motive, and as connected with Providence. It was a remark of Pythagoras, that "Power was never far from necessity." Not the power of the fatalist, but moral power, the power of mind. What, then, was the power of James, as a man? Most authors agree that he was dull and narrow minded. He was simple and weak, rash and obstinate. He had his brother's vices without his talents and good nature. He professed reverence for religion, but he was a bigot and sensualist.¹ He promised more than he could perform, and he was accused of insincerity. He was a pompous Tory. He believed in the Divine right of Kings, and claimed a terrible power, as a monarch, which was made ridiculous by his feebleness as a man. He did not comprehend goodness as an element of royalty, but as a characteristic of weakness. Fear, not love, was the basis of his rule. Coercion and pain made up his system of government, and such men as Jeffreys, Wright and Graham,—were his chosen ministers. It was natural with such views that he should want a standing army to force results which he could not command by merit and influence,—but Parliament would not trust him with one. Surrounded by regal pomp, and invested with regal authority not amenable to man,—he assumed the arrogance of a dictator, and exercised the will of a tyrant. He was brave when there was no danger, and a coward in the presence of superior power. His follies were more profitable to the nation than his wisdom, and his mistakes helped to lessen the mischief of his measures. He seemed to be infatuated with the sentiment that the king could do no wrong, and that the people had no rights. It was his ignoble lot to inherit an unhealthy weakness, and to be crushed by the "greatness thrust upon him."

It was evident that James anticipated opposition. When he found, however, that there was no active party to oppose his ascension to the throne he suddenly became confident and overbearing. He did not seem to know that his strength was nominal, and his weakness real. He no longer saw any occasion for disguise. He saw nothing to fear, and therefore nothing to conceal. "He had been everywhere proclaimed without one riot," says Macaulay, "without one seditious outcry. From all corners of the island he received intelligence that his subjects were tranquil and obedient. His spirit rose. The degrading relation to which he stood to a foreign power seemed intolerable. He became proud, punctilious, boastful, quarrelsome.

¹ When Ronquillo, the Spanish ambassador urged the King not to assent with too much facility to the counsels of his priests, James asked whether it was not the custom in Spain for the King to consult with his confessor? "Yes," replied the ambassador, "and it is for that very reason our affairs succeed so ill."—*Hume*.

He held such high language about the dignity of his crown and the balance of power that his whole court fully expected a complete revolution in the foreign politics of the realm."

James was not ignorant of the subsisting relations between Charles and Louis, and of the disgraceful fact that England had been degraded by the money of France. He was not insensible to shame, nor was he fully alive to honor. In his doubt as to his friends at home—he was willing to accept money from an enemy abroad. With his money Louis was counted as a friend. He secretly sent an agent to him to make known his wants, and to declare his submission. He even apologized for a seeming neglect which he was eager to explain. When Louis promptly sent him money, and at some inconvenience apparently—he was overcome by his grateful sense of obligation.¹ He loved his money but feared his power. He could see no danger in the one, provided he had means to compensate him for the use of the other. His means were the rights of his subjects. With Charles and Louis—they had served as a currency. Not edicts for edicts, legislation for legislation,—but arbitrary power for money. Louis was willing to buy with means not his own, and Charles and James were willing to sell what did not belong to them. If the sale had been completed, France would have been everything, and England nothing. James did not appear to realize the true dignity of self respect more than Charles, nor to comprehend the great truth that the prerogatives and duties of the crown were neither his to compromise, nor neglect. His ministers deemed it presumption to look higher than their master, and they saw no degradation in obsequious attentions to Barillon, the French minister,—whose chief business it was to act the spy and betray the nation.

During the reign of James,—he had the full benefit of parties, or factions, in one way or another, so far as they could agree to unite, and of every possible variety of coalitions,—either for special or general objects. In turn, he was for them all and against them all,—and ultimately all

¹ The day after the death of his brother, James professed to Barillon great friendship for Louis, and in the most abject terms asked for money. Before his request could be communicated Louis had anticipated his wants, and had sent him bills of exchange for the sum of 500,000 livres. Barillon gives an account of its reception to his master. He says, — "This prince was extremely surprised, and said with tears in his eyes, "It is the part of the King your master alone, to act in a manner so noble, and so full of goodness to me. I own to you

that I feel more sensibly what he has done in this, than anything that may happen to me in the course of my life: for I plainly see the bottom of his heart, and how desirous he is that my affairs may prosper. He has even outrun what I could possibly wish, and has prevented my wants."—*Dalrymple*, Vol. II, Appendix, p. 184. When the boastful language of James was reported to Louis it diverted him. He said, "My good ally talks big, but he is as fond of my pleasure as ever his brother was."

united against him, except a few Tories who became bewildered in vain attempts to understand why infallibility in theory should become error in practice. Securely on the throne, James did not hesitate to act the partisan, and to prepare the people for the general election. The Tories were profoundly impressed with their own importance, and on all occasions sought to magnify their respect for the King, and to express their utter detestation of the Democrats.¹ This period and the party contrivances of the crown to crush all opposition either by intimidation or by direct interference with the rights of the freeholders—are so admirably described, in a word, by Macaulay—it would be a loss to the reader not to quote him. He says,—

“The magistrates of Middlesex thanked God for having confounded the designs of those regicides and excluders who, not content with having murdered one blessed monarch, were bent on destroying the foundations of monarchy. The city of Gloucester execrated the blood thirsty villains who had tried to deprive his majesty of his just inheritance. The burgesses of Wigan assured their sovereign that they would defend him against all plotting Ahithophels and rebellious Absaloms. The grand jury of Suffolk expressed a hope that the Parliament would proscribe all the excluders. Many corporations pledged themselves never to return to Parliament any person who had voted for taking away the birthright of James. Even the capital was profoundly obsequious. The lawyers and traders vied with each other in servility. Inns of court and inns of chancery sent up fervent professions of attachment and submission. All the great commercial societies, the East India Company, the African Company, the Turkey Company, the Muscovia Company, the Hudson’s Bay Company, the Maryland Merchants, the Jamaica Merchants, the Merchant Adventurers, declared that they most cheerfully complied with the royal edict which required them still to pay custom. Bristol, the second city of the island, echoed the voice of London. But nowhere was the spirit of loyalty stronger than in the two Universities. Oxford declared that she would never swerve from those religious principles which bound her to obey the king without any restrictions or limitations. Cambridge condemned, in severe terms, the violence and treachery of those turbulent men who had maliciously endeavored to turn the stream of succession out of the ancient channel.

“Such addresses as these filled, during a considerable time, every number of the London Gazette. But it was not only by addressing that the Tories

¹ “The Tories,” says Macaulay, “were is not steadily Whig or Tory, but which loud in professions of attachment to their inclines alternately to Whiggism and to new master. The hatred of the Whigs was Toryism, was still on the Tory side.”—*Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 437.

showed their zeal. The writs for the new Parliament had gone forth, and the country was agitated by the tumult of a general election. No election had ever taken place under circumstances so favorable to the court. Hundreds of thousands whom the Popish Plot had scared into Whiggism had been scared back by the Rye-House Plot into Toryism. In the counties the government could depend on an overwhelming majority of the gentlemen of three hundred a year and upward, and on the clergy almost to a man. Those boroughs which had once been the citadels of Whiggism had recently been deprived of their charters by legal sentence, or had prevented the sentence by voluntary surrender. They had now been reconstituted in such a manner that they were certain to return members devoted to the crown. Where the townsmen could not be trusted, the freedom had been bestowed on the neighboring squires. In some of the small western corporations, the constituent bodies were in great part composed of captains and lieutenants of the Guards. The returning officers were everywhere in the interest of the court. In every shire the lord lieutenant and his deputies formed a powerful, active, and vigilant committee for the purpose of cajoling and intimidating the freeholders. The people were solemnly warned from thousands of pulpits not to vote for any Whig candidate, as they should answer to Him who had ordained the powers that be, and who had pronounced rebellion a sin not less deadly than witchcraft. All these advantages the predominant party not only used to the utmost, but abused in so shameless a manner, that grave and reflecting men, who had been true to the monarchy in peril, and who bore no love to Republicans and schismatics, stood aghast, and argued from such beginnings the approach of evil times.”¹

The motives of James centred in self and royalty. His unlimited confidence in the doctrine of divine right—divested him of all doubt as to the correctness of his own opinions. His own assertions were sufficient to establish his prerogatives, and the royal will was paramount to law. He saw but one great difficulty to be overcome, and that was to control the Parliament. Without this—he was powerless to execute his plans. That it was his design to become absolute master—there can be no doubt. His desperate expedients to monopolize all the sources of influence, and to exclude by trick, or force, all adverse party action—gave him a Parlia-

¹ *Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 442.

“It would be easy,” says Macaulay, “to fill a volume with what Whig historians and pamphleteers have written on this subject. I will cite only one witness, a Churchman and a Tory. ‘Elections,’ says Evelyn, ‘were thought to be very indecent-

ly carried on in most places. God gives a better issue of it than some expect.’ May, 10, 1685.) Again he says, ‘The truth is, there were many of the new members whose elections and returns were universally condemned.’ (May 22.)”

ment, as servile as it was contemptible. Most of the members were his official slaves. He purchased them, and it is a sad commentary on the times, that so many were willing to be sold.¹ The payment of money, to the lovers of money, to secure office, is a high virtue compared to the disgraceful fraud that resorts to trick and deception to disfranchise the people. He counted upon his powerful ally, the King of France,—and not without good reasons, he could rely upon the practical sympathies of Spain and the Papists. He looked upon the Church of England as certain for the crown,—for although he did not know what it was to be sincere himself, he could not think for a moment that the dignitaries of the Church and its powerful institutions could have the audacity to teach passive obedience, and at the same time exercise a discriminating submission. Such a defiance of all decency shocked his good opinion of the Church. He had no substantial reason why he should be particularly lenient to Episcopacy, to favor the Exclusionists, or to make friends with the Roundheads and Republicans. He had received no favor from them when they possessed the power of denial, and he only waited for an opportunity which he was not slow to secure to vindicate the high prerogatives of the crown, and retaliate the many insults heaped upon Popery. His opponents were not factious,—but sincerely disposed to second all constitutional measures calculated to advance the prosperity of the nation.

His misrule gave encouragement to Monmouth to claim the crown, and by force of arms to relieve the country from despotism. It was a desperate remedy, but many were found, with ambitious motives and suppressed resentments, to favor the cause,—and to attempt to correct by arms what they could not reach by legislation. Monmouth had been a favorite. His personal address was pleasing and popular, and he had been highly favored by adventitious circumstances. He was made to believe by admirers and flatterers, who saw no danger in inordinate love of distinction, that the general dislike for James, combined with his own popularity, would secure

¹ "All Arts," says Burnet, "were used to manage elections, so that the King should have a parliament to his mind. Complaints came up from all parts of England of the injustice and violence used in elections, beyond what had ever been practised in former times; and this was so universal over the whole nation, that no corner of it was neglected. In the new charters that had been granted, the election of the members was taken out of the hands of the inhabitants, and restrained to the corporation men, all those being left out who

were not acceptable at court." * * *
 "The King said there were not above forty members but such as he himself wished for: they were neither men of parts nor estates, so there was no hope left, either of working on their understandings, or of making them see their interests in not giving the King all at once; most of them were furious and violent, and seemed resolved to recommend themselves to the King by putting everything in his power, and by ruining all those who had been for the Exclusion."

an easy triumph. Two cowards were in the field, each offering a reward for the other's head, and it was more good luck than skill that gave the victory to the stronger party. It was a weak and foolish rebellion,¹ and it had a tendency to irritate the passions of James, and to increase his party bitterness. He imagined that all his opponents would rejoice in the success of Monmouth, and when the rebellion was crushed, and Monmouth was

¹ James Crofts, Duke of Monmouth, was the natural son of Charles the Second by Lucy Walters, or Barlow, and born about ten years before the Restoration. He was the favorite of his father and the idol of the people. Elegant in person, generous in spirit, and fascinating in manners, he secured a popularity that blinded the little discretion he inherited from royal blood. The king required him to conform to the established church. By the advice of Bristol and Castlemaine—he was created Duke of Monmouth—but in opposition to the remonstrances of the queen-mother and Clarendon. He was married at an early period to the countess of Buccleugh, the most wealthy heiress of Scotland. Though a good wife to him, he did not love her. He preferred Lady Henrietta Wentworth whom he loved tenderly, and he saw no sin in their adulterous connection. "Buckingham, observing the unbounded affection of the King for this young man," says Lingard, "resolved to set him up as competitor for the crown in opposition to the Duke of York." Monmouth was as much loved by the people as the Duke of York was hated. When asked, if he intended to own him for his successor, his father instantly replied, that, "much as he loved the duke he had rather see him hanged at Tyburn, than own him for his legitimate son." He was banished and pardoned by his father for his indiscretions only to commit new ones, and was finally executed for organizing an army to invade England, joined by the Duke of Argyle of Scotland, against the rule of James the Second—which they termed a usurpation. At this time there were many outlaws on the Continent, and "their information," says Macaulay, "concerning the temper of the public

mind was chiefly derived from the worst members of the Whig party." Though not so wicked, probably, as stated by Macaulay, still, most readers would agree that such as Robert Ferguson, John Wildman, Henry Danvers, John Ayloffe, Nathaniel Wade, Richard Goodenough, Richard Rumbold, Lord Gray, are recorded to be, would be dangerous counsellors to such a person as Monmouth. Read Macaulay, Vol. I, p. 486. Cooke says,—“The insurrections of Argyle and Monmouth, are events only collaterally connected with the history of the two parties. Argyle's sentiments had been those of an English Tory, until, like many others, he had been converted by the tyranny of which he was himself the subject. Monmouth invaded England in order to usurp a throne to which he had no legal title, and he was supported by large bodies of the people. But neither of these designs were countenanced by the Whigs.”—Vol. I, p. 397. Before his death, he acknowledged his illegitimacy, and expressed his penitence for the crime he had committed. In reply to the solicitations of bishops Kenn, Turner, and Dr. Jenison and Dr. Hooper—the clergymen appointed to attend Monmouth upon the scaffold, he answered, “I shall say but very little; I come to die; I die a Protestant of the Church of England.”—“My Lord,” rejoined his clerical attendants, “if you be of the Church of England, you must acknowledge the doctrine of non-resistance to be true.” His adultery was of secondary importance. They repeated,—“*We desire only an answer to this point,*” the doctrine of non-resistance,—but the victim bared his neck for the axe without a word of reply.—See *Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 397.

a cowardly suppliant on his knees before him pleading for mercy, he doubtless felt that the time had come when all would acknowledge his power and tremble. He felt that all his enemies were consolidated into one body, and that there was but one neck to be severed.

By his royal assurance and cunning appeals to unscrupulous adventurers, and cowardly renegades, he secured the coöperation of Scotland and Ireland. He became so conscious of a Cæsar's power—that he no longer saw any need of friends and allies. He had become a self-protective power. He enslaved the Parliament, the Church, and the Universities, and displaced all honest officials who were dangerous to his kingdom. He was opposed, but opposition excited his royal wrath. To his rule, he added cruel severities, and if he could not persuade, he was ready to terrify his subjects into humble and abject submission.¹ Becoming impatient—he surrendered himself to the sway of vindictive passions. As he counted conscience nothing but an obstacle, he looked for bad men to serve him. Good men, men who loved freedom and revered the Constitution, were summoned as criminals, and treated as traitors. Honest judges and jurymen, independent members of Parliament and venerable prelates—were reprimanded, dismissed and imprisoned. The criminal who had money to pay for his ransom, or the wickedness to further the purposes of the King—was pardoned. The innocent man, who denounced usurpation and claimed the inalienable immunities of citizenship—was degraded as a culprit and made to suffer. Soldiers were exempted from penalties due to crime, and reserved for the work of bloodhounds. Dissenters were followed and watched by spies—and every movement, word or look reported to the Court of High Commissioners. Such men as Baxter, Bunyan, and Howe, were treated with vulgar insolence and cruelty, and their works burned by the common hangman. John Locke was respected and feared, but not trusted.² Some

¹ Barillon says in a letter to Louis,—“That he had communicated his orders to King James, and made a further offer of what troops James should want from France, to oppress his enemies, and make himself be obeyed by his subjects.”—*Dalrymple*, Vol. III, Appendix, p. 178.

² “John Locke,” says Macaulay, “hated tyranny and persecution as a philosopher; but his intellect and his temper preserved him from the violence of a partisan. He had lived on confidential terms with Shaftesbury, and had thus incurred the displeasure of the court.” * * * “In one point, however, he was vulnerable. He was a student of Christ Church in the University of

Oxford. It was determined to drive from that celebrated college the greatest man of whom it could ever boast; but this was not easy. Locke had, at Oxford, abstained from expressing any opinion on the politics of the day. Spies had been set about him. Doctors of divinity and masters of arts had not been ashamed to perform the vilest of all offices, that of watching the lips of a companion in order to report his words to his ruin.” * * * “When it was found that treachery could do nothing, arbitrary power was used. After vainly trying to inveigle Locke into a fault, the government resolved to punish him without one. Orders came from Whitehall that he should be

of the nobility, high in position and of great influence, who hesitated to serve the king—were dishonored, by dismissal, or fined and imprisoned. In one thing James succeeded. In the choice of his servile tools he is entitled to a record of infamy not to be surpassed by any tyrant of any age. He believed in the theory of coercion. He was King. He could do no wrong. That he was infallible he had been taught to believe himself, and in this conviction he was sustained by the Church and Tories. That his infallibility was doubted only demonstrated the necessity of coercion. This conceded, it was consistent to be cruel. Cruelty in all its hideous forms—belongs to the scale of the system, and the inventive genius of humanity has not yet been exhausted as to the last degree to be marked upon it. To show the revolting features of such a theory, reduced to practice, in good faith—some examples are briefly given from the records of Jeffreys—the Lord Chief Justice of James.¹ These cannot be too often repeated, or too much studied. They illustrate the capabilities of human nature,—in its weakness, wickedness and fanaticism. As a magistrate Jeffreys was a monster. It is recorded that his services and the brutal and insolent manner of rendering them, were particularly acceptable to the king—his master.

In sentencing a woman to be whipped at the cart's tail,—he exclaimed,—“Hangman, I charge you to pay particular attention to this lady! Scourge her soundly, man! Scourge her till the blood runs down! It is Christmas; a cold time for madam to strip in! See that you warm her shoulders thoroughly!” When he passed judgment on Ludowick Muggleton, the drunken tailor who fancied himself a prophet,—he roared—“Impudent rogue! thou shalt have an easy, easy, easy punishment!” He was sentenced to the pillory and almost killed with brickbats. The celebrated Richard Baxter was accused of complaining of the persecution which the Dissenters suffered, and presented himself at Westminster Hall to ask that he might be allowed a proper time for his defence. “Jeffreys burst out into

ejected, and those orders the dean and canons made haste to obey.” * * * “Locke was travelling on the Continent for his health when he heard that he had been deprived of his home and of his bread without a trial or even a notice.” * * * “He quietly repaired to Utrecht, where, while his partners in misfortune were planning their own destruction, he employed himself in writing his celebrated letter on Toleration.” —*Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 505. But why should Macaulay omit in this example

of character, the teachings of history? John Locke was a democrat, in faith, philosophy, and practice. The facts of his integrity, and of his great ability as a philosopher, made him a formidable enemy to a Tory king who had been taught to fear the truth. In writing his letter on Toleration, he accomplished a thousand times more damage to the Tory cause than was accomplished by all the schemes of the exiled Whigs.

¹ These extracts are made from Macaulay's *England*.—Vol. I, pp. 417-619.

a storm of rage. 'Not a minute,' he cried, 'to save his life. I can deal with saints as well as with sinners. There stands Oates on one side of the pillory; and if Baxter stood on the other, the two greatest rogues in the kingdom would stand together.' When the trial came on at Guildhall—Baxter was accompanied by Doctor William Bates, an eminent non-conformist divine, and by Pollexfen and Wallop—two Whig barristers of great note. The friends of Baxter crowded the court. Pollexfen had hardly commenced his address to the jury, before he was abruptly interrupted by Jeffreys: 'Pollexfen, I know you well. I will set a mark on you. You are the patron of the faction. This is an old rogue, a schismatical knave, a hypocritical villain. He hates the Liturgy. He would have nothing but longwinded cant without book;' and then his lordship turned up his eyes, clasped his hands, and began to sing through his nose, in imitation of what he supposed to be Baxter's style of praying, 'Lord, we are thy people, thy peculiar people, thy dear people.' It was quietly remarked by Pollexfen to the court that his late majesty had thought Baxter deserving of a bishopric. 'And what ailed the old blockhead then,' cried Jeffreys, 'that he did not take it?' His fury now rose almost to madness. He called Baxter a dog, and swore that it would be no more than justice to whip such a villain through the whole city.

"Wallop interposed, but fared no better than his leader. 'You are in all these dirty causes, Mr. Wallop,' said the judge. 'Gentlemen of the long robe ought to be ashamed to assist such factious knaves.' The advocate made another attempt to obtain a hearing, but to no purpose. 'If you do not know your duty,' said Jeffreys, 'I will teach it you.'

"Wallop sat down, and Baxter himself attempted to put in a word; but the chief justice drowned all expostulation in a torrent of ribaldry and invective, mingled with scraps of Hudibras. 'My lord,' said the old man, 'I have been much blamed by Dissenters for speaking respectfully of bishops.' 'Baxter for bishops!' cried the judge; 'that's a merry conceit indeed. I know what you mean by bishops—rascals like yourself, Kidderminster bishops, factions, snivelling Presbyterians!' Again Baxter essayed to speak, and again Jeffreys bellowed, 'Richard, Richard, dost thou think we will let thee poison the court? Richard, thou art an old knave. Thou hast written books enough to load a cart, and every book as full of sedition as an egg is full of meat. By the grace of God, I'll look after thee. I see a great many of your brotherhood waiting to know what will befall their mighty Don. And there,' he continued, fixing his savage eye on Bates, 'there is a doctor of the party at your elbow. But, by the grace of God Almighty, I will crush you all.' One of the counsel attempted to explain that the language of Baxter had been misconstrued, and commenced to read the context to show the fact. 'In a moment he was roared

down. 'You sha'n't turn the court into a conventicle!' Some were heard to weep. 'Snivelling calves!' growled Jeffreys."

Several clergymen of the Established Church were present to testify in favor of Baxter's character,—but they were silenced by the Judge. "Does your lordship think," said Baxter, "that any jury will convict a man on such a trial as this?" "I warrant you, Mr. Baxter," said Jeffreys. "Don't trouble yourself about that." Jeffreys was right. The sheriffs were the tools of the government. After a moment's conference—the jury returned a verdict of guilty. "My lord," said Baxter, as he left the court, "there was once a chief justice who would have treated me very differently." Allusion was made to Sir Matthew Hale. "There is not an honest man in England," said Jeffreys, "but looks on thee as a knave."

In the case of Alice Lisle, a witness hesitated and became silent—he was treated with so much roughness and profanity. "Oh, how hard the truth is," said Jeffreys, "to come out of a lying Presbyterian knave." The witness after considerable pause attempted to explain—but was unintelligible. "Was there ever," exclaimed the judge, with an oath, "was there ever such a villain on the face of the earth? Dost thou believe that there is a God? Dost thou believe in hell fire? Of all the witnesses that I ever met with, I never saw thy fellow." Still the poor man, scared out of his senses, remained mute, and again Jeffreys burst forth: "I hope, gentlemen of the jury, that you take notice of the horrible carriage of this fellow. How can one help abhorring both these men and their religion? A Turk is a saint to such a fellow as this. A pagan would be ashamed of such villainy. Oh, blessed Jesus! What a generation of vipers do we live among!" "I cannot tell what to say, my lord," faltered Dunne. The judge again broke forth into a volley of oaths. "Was there ever," he cried, "such an impudent rascal? Hold the candle to him, that we may see his brazen face. You, gentlemen, that are of counsel for the crown, see that an information for perjury be preferred against this fellow." When Lady Alice was called on for her defence she said, "that though she knew Hicks to be in trouble when she took him in, she did not know or suspect that he had been concerned in the rebellion," and gave other facts to prove her innocence. "The chief justice began to storm. 'But I will tell you. There is not one of those lying, snivelling, canting Presbyterians but, one way or another, had a hand in the rebellion. Presbytery has all manner of villainy in it. Nothing but Presbytery could have made Dunne such a rogue. Show me a Presbyterian, and I'll show thee a lying knave.' In the same style he gave the case to the jury; and took occasion to declaim against the Whigs and Dissenters. After much hesitation and reluctance—the jury were compelled by the threats of the judge to return a verdict of guilty. Jeffreys on the following morning sentenced Alice Lisle to be burned alive that very afternoon. The clergy, and ladies of high rank

interceded to save her, and earnest appeals were made to the King,—but all pleadings for mercy were of no avail. “The utmost that could be obtained was that her sentence should be commuted from burning to beheading. She was put to death on a scaffold in the market-place of Winchester.”

“It has not been generally thought that,” says Macaulay, “either after the rebellion of 1715, or after the rebellion of 1745, the House of Hanover erred on the side of clemency; yet all the executions of 1715 and 1745 added together will appear to have been few indeed when compared with those which disgraced the Bloody Assizes. The number of the rebels whom Jeffreys hanged on this circuit was three hundred and twenty. Lonsdale says seven hundred, and Burnet six hundred.” In Somersetshire, “the chief seat of the rebellion, two hundred and thirty-three prisoners were in a few days hanged, drawn and quartered. At every spot where two roads met, on every market-place, on the green of every village which had furnished Monmouth with soldiers, ironed corpses clattering in the wind, or heads and quarters stuck on poles, poisoned the air, and made the traveller sick with horror. In many parishes the peasantry could not assemble in the house of God without seeing the ghastly face of a neighbor grinning at them over the porch. The chief justice was all himself. His spirits rose higher and higher as the work went on. He laughed, shouted, joked, and swore in such a way that many thought him drunk from morning to night; but in him it was not easy to distinguish the madness produced by evil passions from the madness produced by brandy. A prisoner affirmed that the witnesses who appeared against him were not entitled to credit. One of them, he said, was a papist, and the other a prostitute. ‘Thou impudent rebel,’ exclaimed the judge, ‘to reflect on the king’s evidence! I see thee, villain, I see thee already with the halter round thy neck.’ Another produced testimony that he was a good Protestant. ‘Protestant!’ said Jeffreys; ‘you mean Presbyterian. I’ll hold you a wager of it. I can smell a Presbyterian forty miles.’ One wretched man moved the pity even of bitter Tories. ‘My lord,’ they said, ‘this poor creature is on the parish.’ ‘Do not trouble yourselves,’ said the judge, ‘I will ease the parish of the burden.’ The number of prisoners whom Jeffreys transported was eight hundred and forty-one.” These wretched men were given to loyal Tories, as slaves for ten years—to be banished to some West Indian island. They were worth, it was estimated, from ten to fifteen pounds each, and there was much angry competition for grants. “While the humbler retainers of the government were pillaging the families of the slaughtered peasants, the chief justice was fast accumulating a fortune out of the plunder of a higher class of Whigs. He traded largely in pardons. He was ably assisted in the work of extortion by the crew of parasites who were in the habit of drinking and laughing with him. The office of these men was to drive hard bargains with convicts under the strong terrors of

death, and with parents trembling for the lives of children. A portion of the spoil was abandoned by Jeffreys to his agents."¹

Much more might be added respecting this monster in human form,—but enough has been given, it is to be hoped, to induce the reader to pursue the subject in the volumes of Macaulay and of other historians of England. Jeffreys was promoted to high distinction, and though a favorite minister of the king—he exerted but little influence in the House of Peers. He continued in his gross habits of intemperance, and his end was pitiful indeed.² It was befitting his miserable life. This feature of the reign of

¹ "The Tory ministers," says Cooke, "had no hand in pressing forward the executions; the only manner in which they interfered was to obtain wholesale grants of pardons, which they were careful to sell at the highest possible price."—*Hist. of Party*, VOL. I, p. 406.

² Sir George Jeffreys was appointed chief justice by Charles the Second, by advice of Sunderland. He was so well liked as judge that James made him Lord Chancellor, and one of the commissioners to try the followers of Monmouth. He was disgusting in his servility to men in power, and he hated the Whigs, who had deprived him of his recordership in London. "He was a man of quick and vigorous parts," says Macaulay, "but constitutionally prone to insolence and to the angry passions. When just emerging from boyhood, he had risen into practice at the Old Bailey bar, a bar where advocates have always used a license of tongue unknown in Westminster Hall. Here, during many years, his chief business was to examine and cross-examine the most hardened miscreants of a great capital. Daily conflicts with prostitutes and thieves called out and exercised his powers so effectually that he became the most consummate bully ever known in his profession." * * *

"Impudence and ferocity sat upon his brow. The glare of his eyes had a fascination for the unhappy victim on whom they were fixed; yet his brow and eye were said to be less terrible than the savage lines of his mouth." He was a renegade Roundhead. When he found no advancement in his party, "he made haste to sell his forehead of brass and his tongue of venom

to the court." Charles, becoming disgusted with his insolence and cruelty, said of him, "That man has no learning, no sense, no manners, and more impudence than ten carted street-walkers." * * * "Even when he was sober, his violence was sufficiently frightful; but, in general, his reason was overclouded, and his evil passions stimulated by the fumes of intoxication. His evenings were ordinarily given to revelry."

* * * "He was constantly surrounded on such occasions by buffoons, selected for the most part, from among the vilest pettifoggers who practised before him. These men bantered and abused each other for his entertainment. He joined in their ribald talk, sang catches with them, and, when his head grew hot, hugged and kissed them in an ecstasy of drunken fondness."

* * * "At a dinner which a wealthy alderman gave to some of the leading members of the government, the lord treasurer and the lord chancellor were so drunk that they stripped themselves almost stark naked, and were with difficulty prevented from climbing up a sign-post to drink his majesty's health." * * * "He often came to the judgment seat, having kept the court waiting long, and yet having but half slept off his debauch, his cheeks on fire, his eyes staring like those of a maniac."—*Hist. of England*, VOL. I, p. 418. VOL. II, p. 62. He was a great coward as all such men are. When James had fled, and his servile followers were horror-stricken, and hiding their heads, Jeffreys was discovered looking out of the window of an ale house by one whom he had abused. He was disguised. "The eye-

James is distinctly given that the reader may be enabled to judge of the inevitable results of coercion when reduced to a system, and carried out in practice. James was boldly consistent. He treated all active non-conformists alike. When one step made another necessary he did not hesitate to take it. In his hands coercion had a fair trial. He was impartial. He hardly attempted to disguise any evil which was necessary to his plans. He recognized no friends but those who served him, and all who refused to serve him were enemies. He met them as enemies, and treated them as enemies. He was impartial to his advisers. Advice that did not harmonize with his own opinions was unheeded, except to be noted, whether it came from his holiness the Pope, or from the lord bishops of England. The meanest of his subjects who promised service, and desired opinions—were his chosen counsellors. Believing as he did in coercion, how could he consistently do otherwise? Having power, as he supposed, he was resolved to make the most of it. It was not his policy, but his duty. It was not his judgment, but his mission. It was not his wisdom, but the will of God. To his mind, man had no wisdom, God no attributes. With such convictions of self sufficiency, and comprehending no power but that of coercion, what was his success? Did he build up a party? Did he command the respect and confidence of friends, or the admiration of enemies? Did he succeed in administering the government? Did he satisfy the Tories, the Whigs, the Roundheads, or Republicans? Did he answer the expectations of the Papists, or the Protestants, the Church, or the Parliament? He sadly disappointed them all. He dallied with each and gained all, but the Democrats; he coalesced with all and deceived all he gained, and lost all but a few Tories who saw more safety in pride than

brows, indeed," says Macaulay, "had been shaved away. The dress was that of a common sailor from Newcastle, and was black with cold dust; but there was no mistaking the savage mouth and eye of Jeffreys. The alarm was given. In a moment the house was surrounded by hundreds of people shaking bludgeons and bellying curses." * * * "Two regiments of militia were drawn out to escort him to the Tower, and found the duty a difficult one." * * * "The thousands (composing the mob) who were disappointed of their revenge pursued the coach, with howls of rage, to the gate of the Tower, brandishing cudgels, and holding up halts full in the prisoner's view. The wretched man, meantime, was in convulsions of terror.

He wrung his hands; he looked wildly out, sometimes at one window, sometimes at the other, and was heard even above the tumult crying, 'Keep them off, gentlemen! for God's sake, keep them off!'—*Ibid*, Vol. II, p. 517. It was his wish to be placed in the Tower for safety, and he died there. Such was the prime minister and chief justice of England, under James the Second! "Speaker Onslow informs us," says Lingard, "that Jeffreys on his death bed declared to Dr. Scott, who attended him, that, 'what he did he did by express orders, and that he was not half bloody enough for the prince who sent him thither.'" —*Hist. of Eng.*, Vol. x, p. 91. This testimony is questionable.

honor in principle. This was an age of religious dispute. Society was divided into religious parties, and party struggles were rather of a theological nature than political. In theory—religion was deemed paramount to politics, but as Church and State were connected—politics became practically of more importance than religion. James gained the Church and Parliament by the aid of the clergy and Tories. The Tories claimed him as a Protestant King bound to defend the Protestant cause, and the envoys of Louis distracted him by the opposing counsels of the Pope and the Jesuits. All Dissenters, for a time, were willing to sink their differences, each sect indulging in the hope that it was bound in the end to master all the others.

When James saw that his most persistent advisers were chiefly of the spiritual class,—he was doubtless more confirmed than ever in the belief that as he ruled by divine appointment, he was bound to regard the Church as the true basis of government. He did not require a statesman to aid him, but an hierarchy.¹ An hierarchy established by whom? By God, or man? By the Pope, or the British Parliament? He did not like the Parliament as a source of power,—he had seen its changes. As he counted royalty nothing when divided, it was his sacred duty to protect the throne against all possible causes of division. He believed in the infallibility of the Church of Rome—if he did not heed its admonitions. He saw safety in its immutability. In his belief—it was impossible that the King should be otherwise than orthodox, and he knew what was supposed to be the fate of non-conformists, or heretics. He was a Papist by adoption and by choice. To be a Catholic was above citizenship, and to favor Protestants was to doom them to perdition. As he was not ignorant of the inconsistency of men, to say nothing of their wickedness, who constantly in practice violate their professions,—he did not hesitate to adopt a policy of gradual control as the surest method of ultimate success. He had been cheered and flattered by the Protestants who had proscribed the Catholics, and he only followed their example, in principle, when he claimed position in England—for the Church of Rome. He could not plead non-ability.

¹ The taste of James, and the servile spirit of his followers may be seen in a sketch of a sermon on a public occasion delivered by Francis Turner, bishop of Ely. "He was one of those writers," says Macaulay, "who still affected the obsolete style of Archbishop Williams and Bishop Andrews. The sermon was made up of quaint conceits, such as seventy years earlier might have been admired, but such as moved the scorn of a generation accustomed to the purer

eloquence of Sprat, of South, and of Tillotson. King Solomon was King James. Adonijah was Monmouth. Joab was a Rye House conspirator; Shimei, a Whig libeler; Abiathar, an honest but misguided old Cavalier. One phrase in the Book of Chronicles was construed to mean that the king was above the Parliament; and another was cited to prove that he alone ought to command the militia."—*Hist. of England*, Vol. I, p. 441.

He understood no system of "masterly inactivity." He could not be neutral, for above all crimes, the crime of neutrality in religion was then deemed to be the greatest. As he was anything but a pious man himself, his reverence for the church was of a superstitious nature. This did not lessen its practical realities, nor its holy influences. It increased their sacredness. Superstition impels action, it does not invite it. It is to ignorance what wisdom is to knowledge,—a form of power. Wisdom comprehends knowledge and uses it; superstition is mere sentiment blindly associated with ignorance,—with no means either of correcting itself or of discerning truth in others. It acts but does not reason. It feels but does not see. James, as king, was accountable to God, and as man, to the supreme Pontiff. His duty was plain, his course was clear. He had no choice. Unity was salvation, division death. He adopted a spiritual standard of government, and he proceeded to act in conformity to it.¹ He believed himself to be as sincere as others, who did not agree with him, and he saw more power in his allies in France, Spain and Rome—than in the Protestant Church in England. The first step indicated the bent of his mind, and the parties that had been drawn together for a common object, to secure a government which had been lost,—when they discovered his tendencies began to recede from the crown and each other,—as from dangers more terrible than pestilence and death. They did not come together with any feelings of mutual respect or confidence. Their incongruous union was one of necessity, not of coöperative faith. The faith of each was the

¹ He was not always prepared to obey the Pope. It was the judgment of the Pope, and of leading cardinals, that D'Adda should execute his commission of nuncio to the King of England without the public assumption of that character. James thought otherwise. At the earnest solicitation of the King, Innocent gave his consent. The nuncio, to add to his importance, was consecrated archbishop of Amasia by the titular primate of Ireland, in the chapel at Whitehall, and a day was fixed for his public reception at court in his official character. The duty of introducing him was assigned by James to the duke of Somerset, the first lord of the bedchamber; but that nobleman objected to the penalty to which he should be exposed; and when the King offered him a pardon, replied that a pardon promised before the offence was committed, would not be held valid in a court of law. "I would have you," said

James, "fear me as well as the law." "I cannot fear you," was the answer of the duke; "as long as I commit no offence, I am secure in your majesty's justice." Somerset lost his place and his regiment of the guards.—*Lingard's England*, Vol. x, p. 127. The Pope's nuncio made a splendid public entry at Windsor, on Sunday, July 8d, 1687. His excellency had three coaches, with six horses apiece in each coach. Immediately after his excellency, in two of his coaches, were ten priests, his coach going empty. After them went the lord chancellor's, two of the lord president's (Sunderland), the lord privy seal's (Clarendon), and the lord chamberlain's (Duke of Norfolk) carriage. There were eighteen coaches besides these, with six horses apiece, in which number the Lord Bishop of Durham's (Crewe) was one, and the Bishop of Chester's (Cartwright) another.—*Somers' Tracts*, Vol. xx, p. 267.

faith to master all. No one enjoyed liberty, and the first step to freedom was opportunity. The Church of England began to mingle its fears with its prayers; the Tories saw that the State would be endangered, on the one hand by the Papists, and on the other by its connection with the Church; the Presbyterians and Independents soon realized the startling fact that Dissenters were either to be punished as schismatics, or compelled to submit to spiritual uniformity. All parties became jealous of the royal favor. Each imagined that it did not have its due influence at court. To this jealousy succeeded fear—fear that none but papists could hope for toleration or safety. The Church united against Rome as against a common enemy, and then divided against the King, as an impracticable monarch. The Tories united to defend the Church and to sustain the King, and then divided against both as impracticable antagonists. The dissenters united to defend monarchy, and hoped that political concessions would lead to religious toleration, and give peace under a monarchy where republicanism had failed. Their concessions were treated with indifference and contempt, and the folly of the experiment of attempting to compound one-idea differences was again practically illustrated. The only party that was not expected to unite with these spiritual factions—was the Democratic Party. It acted occasionally, when action was practicable, but it was marked for punishment and destruction. It was said to be dead, but it had risen so many times from the grave that its enemies could have no peace so long as it had even a nominal existence. Its able and distinguished representatives, few in number and destitute of means, excited more terror and created more doubt in the minds of their opponents—than all the religious dissenters in the kingdom. The Parliament, when it was permitted to act, divided into parties corresponding to constituents represented, and it fluctuated in its enactments always in harmony with the dominant power. Each party had its turn, and all parties their failures, but no party its freedom. In the beginning, the king had the influence of all, and in the end of none. The church, in its unity, attempted to administer the government, but failed. It succeeded no better in its varied coalitions. It attempted every variety of experiment, of concession that could be sanctioned by a reasonable self-respect, but it found no coöperative remedy. In despair of agreement, parties returned to their original and rigid outlines as to their invulnerable citadels, each self-satisfied that it was reserved by God for future good, all looking on anarchy as not their work, but the work of Satan. As the sole source of government the Church had failed. So had the Dissenters. When the king found that he could no longer control bodies of men—he sought to regain power by approaching individuals. He saw them singly, he had private interviews with members of Parliament, and thought to succeed by his personal influence, by his royal condescension. Society had been disorganized, it had lost its vitality by violence and congestion, and it

was in its outward movement for relief. It was in a state of revolution. It had a common consciousness, which, while no one could understand, all were made to realize. It was a sensitive condition of general discontent. Power was lost. No one could control. The king lost his power, and in his attempts to regain it—discovered that royalty was but a skeleton divested of life, and that James the Second was no more than an ordinary man. He was no statesman, and could provide no remedy. He could destroy, but he could not build. His numerous minions humbled and disgraced by their deeds of blood and perfidy—deserted their royal master to save themselves. His endeavors to save the crown and to unite the people were pitiful in the extreme. He was too proud to be honest, too weak to be brave. He was too superstitious to be practical, too dull to be shrewd. He was selfish, stupid and obstinate. Failure in himself was a condition of doubt and despondency. He was bewildered. He was ready to consent to anything that promised hope, and when he saw the bravest of his advisers and his own kindred in the ranks of his opponents, his despair sunk him into painful imbecility. When others did not seem to care for him, he did not appear to care for himself. As an avowed servant of God, he was a mystery to himself. As a Christian, he found no help in the Church. As a man, he saw his equal in the meanest, of his subjects.

During the reign of James—it was early seen by discriminating minds that he was unequal to the administration of government, and that the many conflicting sub-divisions of society rendered ultimate harmony impracticable. These truths were seen by some of the honest of all parties, especially by the statesmen of the Democratic Party, who long had been proscribed as disloyal subjects, and unsafe advisers to the crown. The utter failure of the king to administer the government on constitutional principles, was so obvious, and the dangers of misrule and anarchy so imminent,—that a large majority of the Free-holders were literally compelled to acknowledge the necessity of taking prompt and immediate measures to save the government from violence and imbecility, and the nation from ruin. The Whigs controlled the Commons two to one, and the great importance of the popular branch of government was fully demonstrated. The Lords, though about equally divided, united with the Commons in the triumph of principle. Party and prejudice, hereditary power and the pride of aristocracy all combined to render compromise difficult, and almost impossible. The time had arrived when the indispensable needs of society, the necessities of government, the safety of life, the protection of property, and the great cause of human freedom and justice—demanded the integrity of motive, the skill of statesmanship, the courage of duty, and the bold energies of patriotism. The spirit of faction and imbecility was rebuked, not by party language, but by the appalling presence of danger. Pride was humbled by the dignity of principle, and ambition checked by the failures of weakness

and ignorance. Demagogues, trembling with fear at their own doings; selfish speculators astounded at the frightful results of corruption and the cupidity of partisans; magistrates, who had sold innocence for gold, and blood for place; renegades, who had bartered truth for falsehood, and duty for infamy,—were suddenly turned back in their course of varied iniquities—and compelled to seek safety in silence or concealment. The public eye was inwardly turned upon the convulsions of society, and every word, look and movement of men were watched and scrutinized with painful apprehension. Capacity to suffer had been exhausted, patience had ceased to be a merit, and forbearance a virtue.

The party of the court and cabinet, it may be said, had been active in three divisions: 1. The King and Father Petre¹ were united in holy passion to conduct the government in such a way as to extirpate if possible, the Protestant heresy, and to establish the divine right of kings. 2. The more sensible, and perhaps more selfish Catholics, the Queen, Sunderland and others, and these were favored by the Pope, were opposed to the precipitant counsels of Petre, who was really the confidential adviser of the King. 3. The real Tory party, headed by the Earl of Rochester, and inspired by the Protestant cause, found itself in a helpless condition in the midst of professed friends,—and was subjected to severe trials and numerous divisions.

Though professing a common loyalty to the crown, this political trio of conflicting juntos, motives and ends soon rendered Parliament hostile to the special policy of the King. Partisan peers were added to the lords, and Jeffreys undertook to terrify them into submission to the royal will, but without success.² Free speech was checked in the Commons by intimidation, and patriotism was rewarded by lodgings in the 'Tower.'³ The Whigs

¹ Father Petre was an Englishman of noble family, uncle to the then Lord Petre. He was famed neither for his virtue nor his learning, but neither of these qualifications was requisite for the service of James. He was a man of daring spirit, and zealous in the cause of religion: a Jesuit, and possessing the confidence of his order, who admired in him the boldness and decision which few of them had the courage to imitate. Petre had commended himself to the King during the excitement of the Popish Plot, as a valuable instrument to be employed in questionable emergencies.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 428.

² Jeffreys undertook to answer the opposition lords, as he had been accustomed to

answer witnesses and juries, but his arrogance, his noise, and his menaces, fell idly upon the ears of the members of that assembly. The indignant scorn with which these noblemen treated this attempt to introduce his style of oratory into their house quickly reduced him to his level.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 415.

³ When Parliament presented to the King an expostulatory address upon his violations of law, and his Majesty replied by saying "he did not expect such an address," Coke, of Derby, animated by patriotic sentiments, stood up and said, "he hoped they were all Englishmen, and were not to be frightened out of their duty by a few high words;" he was immediately sent to the Tower, "for

were despondent and quiet, and yet they did not hesitate to encourage the Tories according to their professions, though not according to their pleasure. The masses of the people were ignorant of their political rights, though they had sense enough to be disgusted at what they saw and heard, but not knowledge enough to apply a remedy. The trial of the bishops displayed tyranny in high places, and what in patriotic times had been strength to the crown was made its greatest danger. The king published and re-published his declaration of indulgence, and required "the clergy throughout the kingdom to read it in their churches immediately after divine service." They almost unanimously refused. Urged on by Petre, he added to it an order, which was intended as an insult to the Church. They shall eat their own dung, was the insolent expression of the priest, adopting a phrase to be found in the Old Testament. The bishops united in a petition to the king to recall his order on account of its unconstitutionality, but this was disloyalty.¹ Such an outrage upon the Church

his indecent and undutiful reflecting on the King and this House." The King immediately prorogued the Parliament, and never suffered it again to assemble.—*Smyth's Mod. Hist.* p. 336.

¹ A meeting of the bishops was held at Lambeth Palace, and it was resolved to petition the King to recall his order. The most revered members of the Tory party were reluctantly compelled to ignore their creed of non-resistance and to acknowledge the possibility of an illegal prerogative. The words of the petition were, "that the great averseness found in themselves to their distributing and publishing, in all their churches, your majesty's late declaration for liberty of conscience, proceeds neither from any want of duty nor obedience to your majesty; our holy mother, the Church of England, being, both in her principles and her constant practice, unquestionably loyal, and having, to her great honor, been more than once publicly acknowledged to be so by your gracious majesty; nor yet from any want of tenderness to dissenters, in relation to whom we are willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit, when the matter shall be considered and settled in Parliament and Convocation: but among other considerations, from this especially, because that declara-

tion is founded upon such a dispensing power, as hath been often declared illegal in Parliament, and particularly in the years 1662 and 1672, and in the beginning of your majesty's reign; and is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in church and state, that your petitioners cannot, in common prudence, honor, or conscience, so far make themselves parties to it, as the distribution of it all over the nation, and the solemn publication of it once and again, even in God's house, and in the time of divine service, must amount to in common and reasonable construction." This language gave great offence to James, and after some unavailing attempts to harmonize differences, the bishops were committed to the Tower under the charge of having contrived, written and published a seditious libel. People of all parties and classes looked upon this movement of the King as a great outrage. The popular voice may be inferred from the fact, that, although they were tried by a packed jury—they were acquitted. The verdict was an occasion of universal rejoicing. Reresby calls the tumultuous shout which passed over the kingdom "a very rebellion in noise." The huzza from the audience in court "was echoed from without," says Sir James Mackintosh, "by a shout of joy

proved to be an attack upon the people, and gave courage and strength to the Whig party. The clergy could see no defence but in the prerogatives of the pulpit, no remedy but in the gospel of politics, and the people no religion but in democracy.

The King having gained possession of the sword by placing Catholic officers over the army,—now saw that the repeal of the Test and Habeas Corpus Acts was as necessary to his theory of government, as their enactment had been to the freedom of his subjects. To insure success he asked the aid of Halifax,—the great and skilful manager of all parties, and the consistent friend of none. It was refused. For not doing what even Halifax saw was impossible—he was dismissed from the cabinet, as if he could find comfort and support by dishonoring the most pliable of his friends. The policy of the king was as fatal to civil freedom as it was treacherous to religious liberty. He was true to neither. He was urged on and defended by the priests, and opposed by the Anglican clergy.¹ On losing friends in Parliament he dismissed friends from place and council. “James,” says Cooke, “was now fairly started upon the path which could lead him to ruin; every act he performed only served more completely to alienate the party which had placed him upon the throne.” When he found that the lords and commons no longer gave heed to his fanaticism, nor complied with his wishes, he prorogued Parliament as dangerous to his kingdom. The church had no power without toryism, and toryism could not act and be consistent with itself. The advocates of passive obedience were compelled to acknowledge the right of resistance, and James found to his amazement and chagrin that the Whig and Tory parties were united against the court, and that Papacy was without power. But he was not to be convinced either of his folly or weakness. He made a vain attempt to restrain the

which sounded like a crack of the ancient and massy roof of Westminster Hall;” “but the most terrible echo of that shout,” says Cooke, “which resounded in the ears of the baffled tyrant, was that which was caught up by the troops that surrounded him at Hounslow, and filled the camp with cheers which no military discipline could restrain—this outward burst told him that his soldiers sympathized with the citizens.” The Roman nuncio describes the scene as an “impious outrage against religion,” in terms of unspeakable horror.—*Lingard, Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 444. Dalrymple says, “There is no doubt that the petition and imprisonment of the Bishops were the immediate causes of the dethronement of

King James, because they set the spirits of men, which were moving only slowly before, in an instant in a ferment.”—*Memoirs*, Vol. III, p. 113. More properly speaking,—these were among the many causes of many years.

¹ The controversial writings and private efforts at Proselytism made by the priests, were met by corresponding efforts on the part of the Anglican clergy. Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Jenison, Patrick, Sherlock, Williams, Claget, Gee, Aldrich, Atterbury, Whitby, Wake, Hooper; names which are yet familiar to all who reverence piety, or admire learning; were earnest in the contest.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 418.

publication of works against papacy. He catechised his judges in regard to the validity of the king's dispensing power, and boasted "that he could find twelve judges of his opinion."¹ Losing by degrees the constitutional aids provided for the dignity and efficiency of the government, the King next assumed the exercise of his full prerogative as the supreme head of the Church of England, and under this pretence he established his ecclesiastical commission, so well known for its illegality and tyranny. Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Crewe, Bishop of Durham, Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, the Earl of Rochester, the lord chief justice, were members of this court, and Jeffreys was made the president, without whose presence no business could be performed. The business to be performed by this conclave could safely be trusted to no management but his.² "God," said the King to Barillon, "has permitted that all the laws made to establish Protestantism, now serve as a foundation for my measures to establish true religion, and give me a right to exercise more extensive power than other Catholic princes possess in the ecclesiastical affairs of their dominions."³

Thus, again, it is seen that chaos is the fruit of unprincipled parties, whether they act separately or together. It is seen, also, that the Church is helpless to meet an emergency, or to avert a danger, unless it adapts itself to the ordinary means which are ordained by the judgment of good men to protect society in its wants and needs. It is seen, likewise, how defeated partisans are made to surrender to, and distracted partisans are led wholly to rely upon—the democratic party. To see how party trimmers become lost in their political reckoning when parties are dissolved into nothingness by their treachery to principle. When the people honestly combine to act, and boldly to speak, then the beneficent spirit of safety, like the light of the rising sun, is seen by every eye in every object and person, and found giving distinct outlines to every path.

In this season of doubt and darkness—there was but one party that stood united and erect upon the solid basis of principle, and that was the party of the people. It stood alone and unchanged. It had the proud distinction of being honored by all the parties that had presumed to stigmatize its character, or to misrepresent its records. Its statesmen were respected, and all were ready to honor and trust them. The Church found no power in its zeal, and the Tory no relief in its pride. They detested the men they needed the most, but their unprovided needs admitted not even the poor indulgence of a common indifference. Some few, who were blinded by bigotry, and stinted by the unmeaning complacency of self-righteousness,—assumed to be the subjects of a "higher law," and chose to wait

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 421.

² Mackintosh, p. 66, from Fox's Mss.

³ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 421.

for special signs from heaven to direct their speech and action. Such men are always to be found in all ages, and they are generally permitted to die in ignorance of their own mission. It is a mercy to them that they are not enabled to see that they have the most influence when they say the least, and accomplish most when they do the least. That they have a place in Providence, no man can reasonably deny, but it is more like the vacuum in physics—than the active power that fills it. It is a useful necessity, but not the proudest distinction.¹

When James consented to the marriage of his daughter Mary—to William, Prince of Orange, he did not suppose that a mere permissive act would prove to be more than his wisest judgment.² It was not enough to find that royalty was insufficient for the high purposes of government, and that the difficulties of the nation were mainly caused by departures from democracy. A further step was seen to be necessary, not to subvert the form of the government, but to administer it upon democratic principles, and to place upon the throne a democratic king. In this case Protestantism became an ally to Democracy, as Catholicism had in other periods. William could not claim the crown, but his wife was competent to confer it upon him. Her amiableness of temper, and her unrequited affections for her husband, whose marriage vows were uttered but not redeemed,—led her to declare that he should be the first on the throne as she had acknowledged him first at the altar. Not but others had a superior claim to the succession, to his wife—but her title was made good by the recognition of principle, and not by hereditary tenure.

William had distinguished himself as a democrat, and all eyes were turned to him for relief. Burnet was in Holland to do his part, and Dyckvelt and Zuylesteyne in England to do theirs.³ It is the opinion of Dalrymple that many had a part in this revolution, but this is doubted. "Among

¹ In a letter of Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, who was ever ready to act with the slow or fast of all parties, whenever he could see an opportunity to serve himself, he says, "nothing, in the present conjuncture can be more dangerous than unskilful agitators, warm men, who would be active at a wrong time, and want patience to keep their zeal from running away with them." In speaking of the progress of such men, he says,—"In some particulars, to men at a distance, the engine seemeth to move fast, but by looking nearer, one may see it doth not stir upon the whole matter, so that there is a rapid motion without advancing a step, which is the only miracle that

church hath yet showed to us. Every attempt turneth back upon them."—*Dalrymple*, Vol. III, p. 124.

² "Charles the Second," says Prof. Smyth, "in a most fortunate moment of providence, had suffered his minister Danby to connect the Prince of Orange with the royal family of England. If James had no children, the wife of William thus became first in succession. Even if he had, she remained so in case the direct male line was to be departed from."—*Modern History*, p. 337.

³ At the commencement of 1687 the Prince of Orange had sent Dyckvelt to England as his ambassador, a man well

the letters produced by Dalrymple," says Prof. Smyth, "there are more from the Tory lords than could have been looked for; but the association for joining William, if he came over, was, after all, not sent till the end of June, 1688;—he landed in November;—and was, at last only signed in cypher by four lords, Devonshire, Danby, Shrewsbury, and Lumley; two commoners, Mr. Sidney and Admiral Russell; and one bishop, the Abdiel of the Bench, Compton, then Bishop of London." In their letter to the Prince of Orange, they say, that "there are nine parts of twenty of the people throughout the kingdom who are desirous of a change;¹ * * * that much the greatest part of the nobility and gentry are as much dissatisfied; * * * and very many of the common soldiers do daily show such an aversion to the Popish religion, that there is the greatest probability imaginable of great numbers of deserters which would come from them [the government] should there be such an occasion; and amongst the seamen, it is almost certain, that there is not one in ten who would do them any service in such a war."²

While the King was struggling hard to satisfy his friends, and propitiate his enemies, the Prince of Orange was acquiring means and collecting troops with extraordinary diligence to invade England. To justify his course to the world he published a Declaration of considerable length, setting forth the many grievances of the people, the tyranny of the crown, and his motives for attempting to supply a remedy. He said, "The greatness and security both of kings, royal families, and of all such as are in authority, as well as the happiness of their subjects and people, depend in a most especial manner upon the exact observation and maintenance of these their

informed as to his intentions, and faithful to his interests. In a letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to the Prince, he says of Dyckvelt, "His great prudence, and the zeal he is believed to have for your highness and the princess, has got him the universal good opinion of all parties here, though differing never so much in their religions, which your highness will easily find by the freedom with which they have communicated their innermost thoughts, hopes and fears to him."—*Dalrymple*, Vol. II, p. 194. "It was the business of this agent," says Cooke, "besides the ostensible negotiation with which he was intrusted, to mark the course of popular feeling in the country; to hold frequent communication with the Protestant party; to encourage them in their opposition to Popery; and to nourish their ani-

mosity against France. To this man first the Whig, then the Tory leaders resorted. They continued to communicate with him, and afterwards with his successor, Count Zuylesteyne, as one national party. During the same year, and the commencement of the next, the Bishops of London, Bath, Bristol, and St. Asaph; and among the temporal peers, Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Bath, Halifax, Bedford, Nottingham, Lumley, Mordaunt, Danby, Rochester, Churchill, and even Sunderland, men of every shade of politics—are found in active correspondence with the Prince."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 458. See *Dalrymple's Memoirs*, Vol. II, Appendix.

¹ This single fact confirms all that is claimed for Democracy.

² *Dalrymple*, Vol. III, p. 186.

Laws, Liberties and Customs.—Upon these grounds it is that we cannot any longer forbear to declare, that, to our great regret, we see that those counsellors, who have now the chief credit with the king, have overturned the Religion, Laws and Liberties of those realms, and subjected them, in all things relating to their Consciences, Liberties and Properties, to arbitrary government; and that not only by secret and indirect ways, but in an open and undisguised manner.”¹

The immediate effect of this Declaration in favor of popular rights was to induce the King to make such concessions as would neutralize the promises of William. This was followed by a second Declaration from William, in which he warns the people against “the imperfect redress which is offered,” and reminds them of the solemn promises of the past which the King had broken, and that they could find no relief from despotism “but in Parliament.” “Therefore it is,” he concludes, “that we have thought fit to declare, that we will refer all to a free Assembly of the nation, in a lawful Parliament.”² These Declarations were answered by James, who charged William with usurpation, and called upon “his loving subjects to join with him in the suppressing and repelling of his enemies and rebellious subjects.”³

The Prince also addressed a letter to the officers of the English Army, and Admiral Herbert, and by his order, another to the English fleet. These letters were published in London, the design of which was to inform the Army and Navy of his true intentions. The officers, soldiers and seamen were conjured not to suffer themselves to be abused by a false notion of honor, to serve their King contrary to the manifest interest of their country. These letters, according to Rapin, “had a wonderful effect on the officers, soldiers, and sailors, so that from this time they resolved not to draw their swords in so wrongful a quarrel.”

On the 5th of November—the army of William landed at Torbay—and without opposition. The events of this invasion, the positive character of the invaders, and the passive character of the invaded—were remarkable and deserve special attention. With an army of only twenty thousand, and with no alliance to promise more, to move against a force of double the number, and under circumstances of disadvantage,—and with the certainty of aid from France, should it be asked or permitted, discovered a courage and a confidence most extraordinary. The King was evidently indisposed to credit the rumors respecting the invasion, and made no appeals to his army to oppose it. He became disheartened and desperate. He caused the great seal to be thrown into the Thames,⁴ and ordered

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. v, p. 2.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. v, p. 2.

³ Ibid, Vol. v, p. 15.

⁴ Next to the Prince of Wales the chief

his army to be disbanded. Sacrifice was nothing, if all could be sacrificed alike. He practically adopted the motto "rule or ruin," though some of the Tories were faithful to the last, and ready to restore to power a monarch whose acts of tyranny were only exceeded by his acts of folly and cowardice. He saw nothing but danger at home, and he was willing to increase that danger if he could but escape to a foreign place of safety. It was for the interest of Louis to aid him as he had ample reason to believe, and after repeated and humiliating attempts he escaped to France,—having sent the Queen and her infant son before him. They were received by Louis with every demonstration of respect suited to their high birth and station, and every provision was made for their comfort and dignity that royal munificence could provide.

Here was a new state of affairs. The Tories ever ready to evade popular duties and to assert the technicalities of constructive freedom, "renewed their doctrines of passive obedience and the indefeasible tenure of the crown. Scripture, law, custom, seemed equally to confirm their tenets." Their old maxims of government were repeated, but with no belief whatever that they could be reduced to practice. On the departure of the King from the country—a new question arose. The democrats, who largely controlled the Commons, submitted the following proposition:—"That King James the Second, having endeavored to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom by breaking the original contract between King and people, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of this Kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne is thereby vacant."¹

This was a mixed proposition, and an illogical one. The premises did not strictly warrant the conclusion. The democratic principle of contract between the King and people was clearly recognized, and the fact of a religious contest was asserted in partisan language. The King did not withdraw in a sense that *abdication* would imply, and that the throne was

object of anxiety was the great seal. To that symbol of kingly authority jurists have always ascribed a peculiar and almost mysterious importance. It was kept within a few yards of his own closet. Before his flight James was resolved to do all he could to inflict the evils of anarchy upon the people. He found comfort in revenge. He ordered the great seal and the writs for the new Parliament to be brought to his apartment. The writs which could be found he threw into the fire. Those which had already been sent out he annulled by an

instrument drawn up in legal form. To his general, Feversham, he wrote a letter which could be understood only as a command to disband the army. On his way to France, he was conveyed to Milbank, where he crossed the Thames in a small wherry. As he passed Lambeth he flung the great seal into the midst of the stream, whence, after many months, it was accidentally caught by a fishing net and dragged up."—See *Macaulay*, Vol. II, pp. 486, 508.

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. V, p. 50.

vacant in consequence of such an act was not warranted. It was not legal abdication. That the democrats should attempt to declare it legal is not surprising. They asserted the great principles of democracy, and by the logic of events—they desired to establish a precedent that should relieve the government from an unfaithful servant in view of his acts, and without regard to his language. This was right, in principle, though perhaps it was too much to ask of the Church and Tory Parties, who were evidently resolved upon a regency, or upon any course rather than acknowledge a basis of government practically inconsistent with their views of passive obedience. The proposition, however, was passed by the Commons, and without a division. When sent to the Lords, it was opposed by the Tories, but with no distinct purpose to offer a substitute, except the impracticable proposition of a regency, which would have involved new difficulties without providing a remedy. Some were said to be indisposed, some were absent, but the vote was a democratic victory fifty-one to forty-nine.¹ At the next meeting of the Lords—the first and most important paragraph of the proposition was debated, singly, and adopted by a majority of seven, fifty-three to forty-six, a gain of four. After much discussion, and a labored conference, the paragraph, “that the throne was vacant” was lost, forty-four to fifty-five, and the word “deserted” was substituted for “abdicated.”² The debates which took place on the minor premises and conclusion of this proposition discovered much logical acuteness and learning, and as some authors have impatiently expressed it—on “frivolous topics.” It cannot be justly said that the topics were frivolous, when it is the proper business of statesmen to employ appropriate and exact language in all legislative proceedings.³ In this case, the Democrats could well afford to concede to the Tories all that they asked, as to verbal distinctions, so long as they recognized a principle that was superior to language. They consented to the overthrow of their own party that the nation might be restored to life by democracy. This was the revolution of 1688. Thus, again, royalty failed to save either itself, or the nation, and toryism became powerless when the people acted for themselves.⁴

¹ Lord Churchill, afterwards the great Duke of Marlborough, and a few others, chose to be indisposed; Sancroft, the archbishop, in like manner, to be absent. Of the fourteen bishops that attended, two only, Bristol and London, voted with the Whigs.—*Prof. Smyth*.

² See *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. v.

³ “On the whole,” says *Prof. Smyth*, “it must be confessed that the Whig leaders

conducted themselves through all these transactions with a temper which no political party ever before showed.”—*Modern Hist.*, p. 847.

⁴ In a debate on the state of the nation, in the House of Commons, January 29th, 1689—Col. Birch used the following language:—“When I consider the extraordinary hand of God that brought us hither, and the freedom we are here met in, it amazes

This union of the best and worst men of all parties in favor of democracy was not a political amalgamation, nor was it a coalition, nor a compromise in the ordinary sense of these terms. Such combinations are generally supposed to indicate conceding adjustments of separate interests, or separate lines of policy united on conditions, or concerted action of persons upon special promises of advantage. In other words, the meaning of such terms, is, that conflicting parts may be brought together, each preserving its own distinctive features, in a common whole for a temporary end, but with no promise, or even hopes of permanent harmony. The application of opposite principles in the same thing may be suspended by agreement for a special, or a common end,—but such principles cannot be practically combined in unity, any more than harmony can be deduced from discord, or order from chaos. Right and wrong, truth and error, are unalterable conditions of incompatibility. Progressive causes possess no elements of reversion,—although incitements to investigation are often found in obstacles to progress. Such men as Somers,¹ Devonshire, Bedford, Shrewsbury and their honest followers, had nothing to alter. They had been right, and were so still, and they were ready for instant action. Such men as James, Jeffreys, Sunderland, Nottingham, Halifax, and their followers, who had been Tories, and were so still, had no choice but to confess their errors and crimes,² and surrender unconditionally, not to democrats, but to the protecting power of democratic principles. These, alone, it was conceded by all, were sufficient for the emergency, not as a revolutionary remedy, but as an eternal basis upon which all good governments must stand.

James was willing openly to promise everything, though secretly resolved

me; and I am not able to comprehend this work of God in such an extraordinary manner; and, concerning King James's deposing himself, it is the hand of God. These forty years we have been scrambling for our Religion, and we have saved but little of it. We have been striving against Anti-Christ, Popery and Tyranny."—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. v, p. 51.

¹ Afterwards the great Lord Somers. He was born at Worcester in 1652. He was educated at a private school in Staffordshire, and then entered at Trinity College, Oxford, from which he removed to the Middle Temple. He was highly distinguished as an able and eloquent pleader. He is spoken of in terms of admiration by Burnet. He says, "He held the seals seven years,

with a high reputation for capacity, integrity, and diligence, and was in all respects the greatest man I had ever known in that post." He is recorded in Walpole's *Royal and Noble Authors*, as "one of those divine men, who, like a chapel in a palace, remained unprofaned, while all the rest is tyranny, corruption and folly." He was always a Whig.—See *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. v, p. 42.

² In speaking of the Declaration of Right, prepared by a committee of which Lord Somers was chairman, Macaulay says,— "The Declaration began by recapitulating the crimes and errors which had made a revolution necessary."—*Hist. of England*, Vol. II, p. 605. See *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. v.

to do nothing.¹ He was ready to substitute general pardon for contemplated acts of revenge; to give up the Court of High Commission, and to summon a free Parliament; to reinstate proscribed officials, and to restore the chartered rights of cities; to redress all grievances, even to make great sacrifices, to meet the democratic demands of the people. His partisan ministers saw and acknowledged the necessity of such a surrender,—and yet they sympathized with their royal master in the concealed hopes of treachery, and acquired confidence in the delusive promises of duplicity. On the other hand, the Prince of Orange had an instinctive sagacity to reject without violence, all propositions of compromise, seeing that the party which had been so false to the British Constitution had no power to help the nation but by entire submission to opposite counsels. He abandoned the party to itself in its weakness, that its record and end might be associated with disgrace together. He was not, as Macaulay supposes, “the soul of a mighty coalition,” but the soul of a party whose power was that of principle, and whose action was the great cause of justice. Cook thinks, that “the originators of this revolution were, perhaps, the two best representatives of the two national parties which could have been chosen.” The two referred to were, the Earl of Devonshire, who was a Whig, and Lord Danby, who was a Tory. In confirmation of this view he quotes some lines from Dr. Akenside’s Ode, addressed to the Earl of Huntingdon, and the following note of explanation:—“At Whittington, a village on the edge of Scarsdale in Derbyshire, the Earls of Devonshire and Danby, with the Lord Delameer, privately concerted the plan of the revolution. The house in which they met is at present a farm-house, and the country people distinguish the room where they sat by the name of the plotting-parlor.” This was only an incident. A comprehensive view of the subject may be found in the declaration which the Earl of Devonshire delivered to the mayor of Derby, and in another which was subscribed by a great number of the nobility and gentry at Nottingham, evincing much courage and setting forth the great truths of democracy.² A more extended and systematic analysis, however, is given by Guizot:—“The History of the Revolu-

¹ Parl. Deb., VOL. v, p. 21. Hist. of Party, VOL. 1, p. 402. *passim*.

² The *Devonshire* paper briefly recites the political calamities of the period, and declares the right of resistance. The *Nottingham* paper more boldly asserts, “That not being willing to deliver their posterity over to such a condition of Popery and Slavery, as their oppressions inevitably threatened, they would, to the utmost of their power, oppose the same, by joining

with the Prince of Orange, for the recovery of their almost ruined laws, liberties and religion. And herein they hoped all good Protestant subjects would, with their lives and fortunes, be assistant to them, and not be bug-beared with the opprobrious terms of rebels, by which the court would fright them to become perfect slaves to their tyrannical insolences and usurpations. For they assured themselves, that no rational and unbiassed person would judge it Rebel-

tion of England," he says, "comprises three grand periods. In the first, under Charles I. (1625-1649), the Revolution was preparing, was put forth, and took its stand. In the second, under the Long Parliament and Cromwell (1649-1660), it essayed to found its own form of government, which it called a Republic, and fell in the attempt. The third period is that of monarchical re-action, successful for a while, under Charles II., who, in his cautious selfishness, aimed at nothing beyond his own personal enjoyment, but ruined by the blind passion of James II., who aimed at absolute power. In 1688, England achieved the point she aimed at in 1640, and quitted the career of revolution for that of liberty."¹ This outline is a Tory's concession to democracy.

To understand this revolution it is necessary to know the character of William. He was a remarkable man. In religion—he was a Calvinist, the religion of his ancestors. His favorite tenet was predestination, and the great importance which he attached to the doctrine—may serve to account for his early and fixed determination to advance the cause of freedom, and to wear the British crown. In his belief it was to be so, and whether to wait, or to act—his purpose was unalterable, his courage and wisdom adequate for all emergencies. He boldly claimed the right to express his own opinions, and he promptly conceded the same right to others. In youth he manifested a deep interest in public affairs, and discussed them with an ability not surpassed by the fathers of the commonwealth.

"At twenty-one," says Macaulay, "in a day of gloom and terror, he was placed at the head of the administration. At twenty-three he was renowned throughout Europe as a soldier and politician. He had put domestic factions under his feet; he was the soul of a mighty coalition; and he had contended with honor in the field against some of the greatest generals of the age."

From early childhood to manhood—he suffered from physical weakness and disease, and yet his powerful will annihilated pain as an obstacle, and

lion to defend their Laws and Religion, which all English princes have sworn at their coronation; which oath, how well it hath been observed of late, they desired a free Parliament might have the consideration of. They indeed own it rebellion to resist a king governed by law; but he was always accounted a tyrant that made his will his law; and to resist such an one they justly esteemed no rebellion, but a necessary defence: and on this consideration they

doubted not of all honest men's assistance, and humbly hope for, and implored the great God's protection, that turned the hearts of people as pleased him best; it having been observed, that people could never be of one mind without his inspiration, which had in all ages confirmed that observation, '*Vox populi est vox Dei.*'—*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. V, p. 17.

¹ Hist of Eng. Revolution, Preface to Edition of 1841.

weakness as a difficulty. He had a passionate and sensitive nature, but his self-possession always secured him an undisturbed serenity. He was capable of deep love and deep sorrow. Though of a passionate disposition,—he was never lost to justice or magnanimity. His remarkable foresight and conscious strength to accomplish his patriotic mission—cannot be too much admired or over-estimated. He was surrounded by difficulties and dangers—which could neither be seen nor measured. That the author may not be accused of extravagant language to create an ideal hero to serve a theory,—he is induced to quote a writer of distinguished ability, whose lectures in England have gained him a high reputation in America.¹ He says,—“But here we ought certainly to ask, how, after all, was the Prince of Orange to attempt any regular enterprise against the crown of England? Observe his difficulties, and you will then understand his merit. He was at the head of only a small republic; that republic had been reduced, but a few years before, to the very last extremities by the arms of Louis. How was William to prepare an expedition, and not be observed by the French and English monarchs? How to prosecute it, and not be destroyed by their power? If he attacked England with a small force, how was he to resist James? If with a large one, how was Holland, in his absence, to resist Louis? In either case how was he to extricate himself from the English and French fleets, which might prevent his landing in the first place, or at least render his return impossible in the second? How could he expect that the English who had so long contended for the empire of the seas with their great rivals, the Dutch, would forego the triumph of a naval victory, if it was once put within their reach? How was William to trust to the representations of the English patriots, who might be suspected of judging of their countrymen through the medium of their own wishes and resentments? How was he to expect, even if he landed, that the gentry and nobility would hazard their lives and fortunes by appearing in arms, when only seven of them had as yet ventured, by any distinct act, to incur the guilt of treason? What spirit of freedom, much more of resistance, had the nation shown, now for seven years, since the political victory of Charles the Second over the Exclusionists? Monmouth, the idol of the English populace, had just been destroyed by James without difficulty; so had Argyle. What was to be expected from a country that was loud, indeed, in their abuse of Popery, but whose pulpits, and public meetings, and courts of justice, resounded with the doctrines of passive obedience, and whose very Parliaments seemed to admit the same fatal principles.”

“Put the case that William should even succeed so far as to oblige James

¹ Prof. Smyth.

to call a Parliament, give up his illegal pretensions, and promise conformity to the laws in future. To what end or purpose, as far as William himself was concerned? What benefit was to accrue to him, but the mere liberty of returning? While James was to be left, in silence and at his leisure, to wait for more favorable times, watch his opportunities, recover his authority, and persecute and destroy, one by one, all who had contributed to resist or modify his prerogative."¹

It will certainly not be out of place to insert here a passage from Buckle:—"It is indeed," says he, "difficult to conceive the full amount of the impetus given to English civilization by the expulsion of the House of Stuart. Among the most immediate results, may be mentioned the limits that were set to the royal prerogative;² the important steps that were taken towards religious toleration;³ the remarkable and permanent improvement in the administration of justice;⁴ the final abolition of a censorship over the press;⁵ and, what has not excited sufficient attention, the rapid growth of those great monetary interests by which, as we shall hereafter see, the prejudices of the superstitious classes have in no small degree been counterbalanced.⁶ These are the main characteristics of the reign of William III.; a reign often aspersed, and little understood,⁷ but of which it may be truly said, that, taking its difficulties into due consideration, it is the most successful and the most splendid recorded in the history of any country."⁸

The determination of Parliament to return the government to its constitutional standard, and the willingness of the Prince of Orange to respond to its call, and his ability to comprehend their wants, and to provide the means to meet them,—are great and instructive facts.

When he arrived at St. James, the public mind was in a state of the greatest excitement. Though the troops had been stationed with particular reference to special duties, and all were confident of speedy relief, it was natural that fear should be blended with hope, and that apprehensions of danger should abate the apparent means of safety. He was received with demonstrations of joy and respect, and the leading men of all parties

¹ Modern History, p. 339.

² See Somers' Tracts, Vol. x, pp. 263, 264. Mahon's Hist. of England, Vol. i, p. 9.

³ The Toleration Act, passed 1689, was called by the dissenters their Magna Charta.

⁴ See Campbell's Chancellors, Vol. i, pp. 402, 355, and his Chief Justices, Vol. ii, pp. 95, 116, 118, 136, 142, 148.

⁵ This was effected before the end of the 17th century. See Campbell's Chancellors,

Vol. iv, pp. 121, 122; Parl. Deb., Vol. xvii, p. 994; Hunt's Hist. of Newspapers, Vol. i, pp. 161, 162; Somers' Tracts, Vol. xiii, p. 155; also, Macaulay's England.

⁶ See Hist. of Party, Vol. ii, pp. 5, 148; Sinclair's Hist. of Revenue, Vol. iii, pp. 6, 9.

⁷ See Allison's Hist. of Europe, Vol. vii, p. 5.

⁸ Hist. of Civilization in England, Vol. i, p. 289.

were there, each to see which could honor him the most. "The lawyers paid their homage," says Macaulay, "headed by Maynard, who, at ninety years of age, was as alert and clear headed as when he stood up in Westminster Hall to accuse Strafford. "Mr. Seargent," said the Prince, "you must have survived all the lawyers of your standing." "Yes, sir," said the old man, "and but for your highness, I should have survived the laws too."¹

"But," continues Macaulay, "though the addresses were numerous and full of eulogy, though the acclamations were loud, though the illuminations were splendid, though St. James' Palace was too small for the crowd of courtiers, though the theatres were every night, from the pit to the ceiling, one blaze of orange ribbons, William felt that the difficulties of his enterprise were but beginning. He had pulled a government down. The far harder task of re-construction was now to be performed."²

This view of Macaulay, it is humbly conceived, is not a correct one. William had not "pulled a government down." This had been done by James, and it was the mission of William to restore it. It was restoration not re-construction. It is true, it was restoration with additional safeguards, but all that was democratic was retained, with the super-addition of results of progress and experience. A government has no identity except in a definite constitution, and that identity is lost the moment the constitution is violated. England was not conquered, but its lost rule restored. A country may lose its liberties by a revolution ending in despotism. Or a despotism may be conquered by the spirit of freedom. These are fundamental changes, and restoration, or re-construction is the process. A rebellion, however, against a constitutional government, ceases when it is mastered,—and the government remains intact, untouched, unchanged. A conqueror of forces arrayed against a constitutional government cannot destroy rights existing before a rebellion, nor can he assume new rights after a rebellion by virtue of his success. A military power that claims absolute control as an element of conquest is the tyranny of war, not the war of peace. This was the doctrine of the barbarous ages, when the protective principles of democracy were but little understood. It was the power of might, not of right. That it was understood by William is made clear both by his language and his acts. In this—Macaulay fails to do him justice, and to be consistent with himself. He says,—

"The feeling with which William regarded France explains the whole of his policy toward England. His public spirit was a European public spirit. The chief object of his care was not our island, not even his native Holland, but the great community of nations threatened with subjugation by one too powerful member. Those who commit the error of considering

¹ Hist. of England, Vol. II, p. 540.

² Ibid.

him as an English statesman must necessarily see his whole life in a false light, and will be unable to discover any principle, good or bad, Whig or Tory, to which his most important acts can be referred."

It must be admitted, that if the lesser does not include the greater, it is certain the greater includes the lesser. His "European public spirit" was as good for England as for Europe, and if he had not joined the Whigs of England in their views and policy he could not have accomplished his more extended mission. He chose the good and avoided the bad, he preferred the Whig, and rejected the Tory,—and hence, it may be said—his statesmanship was as complete for England as it was for Europe. A democratic statesman is a statesman for all countries alike. A man who is ambitious to control without reference to patriotic motives, or principles of right, cannot be called a statesman in the highest sense of the term. All the motives ascribed by Macaulay to William in his intercourse with Charles the Second, James the Second, with Louis and Monmouth,—are not inconsistent with the highest patriotism. The highest patriotism begins at home and acquires a power to be useful abroad. Its usefulness abroad embraces home as an element of its action, the very principle of national success. That his comprehensive mind should be directed to the affairs of other nations, and that he would be excited by acts of official discourtesy, or injustice, and be led to remedy and resent such acts was not only natural but commendable. Indeed, this view is consistent with the expressed views of Macaulay himself—when he concludes his eloquent remarks on the French monarchy—that the God of Gideon "had raised up William of Orange to be the champion of all free nations and of all pure churches." And in speaking of his devotion to duty, and his indifference to death, he says,—
"The ardor and perseverance with which he devoted himself to his mission have scarcely any parallel in history. In comparison with his great object, he held the lives of other men as cheap as his own. It was but too much the habit, even of the most humane and generous soldiers of that age, to think very lightly of the bloodshed and devastation inseparable from great martial exploits; and the heart of William was steeled, not only by professional insensibility, but by that sterner insensibility which is the effect of a sense of duty."

No greater compliment could be uttered. The insensibility which is the effect of a sense of duty, is the highest patriotism. The meaning is obvious,—though to connect insensibility with a sense of duty—is to speak of the soul in its highest condition of sentiment as the lowest. Duty implies integrity of purpose, and consistency of action,—comprehending alike the judgment and the affections, the moral and religious sentiments.

When the crown was offered to William and Mary, at Whitehall, both houses joined in a Declaration, giving explicit reasons for such a movement, and they constitute a sort of indictment of the people against their King:

“Whereas the late king, James the Second, by the assistance of divers evil counsellors, judges, and ministers, employed by him, did endeavor to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion, and the laws and liberties of this kingdom; by assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws, and the execution of laws, without consent of Parliament; by committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates, for humbly petitioning to be excused from concurring to the said assumed power;—by issuing and causing to be executed, a commission, under the great seal, for erecting a court called ‘The Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes;’ by levying money for and to the use of the crown, by pretence of prerogative, for other time and in other manner than the same was granted by Parliament; by raising and keeping a standing army within the kingdom, in time of peace, without consent of Parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law; by causing several good subjects, being Protestants, to be disarmed, at the same time when Papists were both armed and employed contrary to law; by violating of members to serve in Parliament; by prosecutions in the Court of King’s Bench for matters and causes cognizable only in Parliament; and by divers other arbitrary and illegal causes: And whereas, of late years,—partial, corrupt, and unqualified persons have been returned, and served on juries, and particularly divers jurors in trials for high treason, which were not freeholders; and excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases, to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects; and excessive fines have been imposed; and illegal and cruel punishments inflicted; and several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures, before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied: all which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws, and statutes, and freedom of this realm.”¹

“Such were the articles of accusation,” says Prof. Smyth, “preferred, and it will be found justly preferred, against James.”

This Declaration, in addition to the above extract, proceeds to recite the fact of the King’s abdication, and the measures necessary to place the Prince of Orange on the throne, and also, to serve as “A Declaration of Rights,”² as it was called. William had been frequently subjected to discouraging and unexplained delays, and many had urged him to a vigorous course, and with reference to principle, law or courtesy. These impatient advisers were either rebuked, or unheeded. He was induced to take no step that indicated either doubt or fear, or to manifest a revolutionary spirit—where he believed that a sense of duty recognizing a constitutional standard would serve him better. After the reading of the Declaration, the Marquis of Halifax, Speaker of the House of Lords, made a solemn

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. v, p. 108.

² Smyth, Modern Hist., p. 352.

tender of the Crown to their highnesses, in the name of both houses, the representatives of the nation, and William made a brief answer accepting it. William and Mary were then proclaimed, and in due time crowned "King and Queen of England, France and Ireland, with all the dominions and territories thereunto belonging."¹

The Revolution of 1688 was defensive, or rather it was almost by general consent.² A revolution by consent shows a condition of doubt in opinion, and confidence in principle. It does not remove the partisan, nor obliterate the sources of difference. Party spirit, without principle for its basis, is checked by its own excesses. It becomes self-disgusted by multiplying differences to adjust differences, errors to correct errors,—a process that destroys itself, and has no end but failure. Coercive power had exhausted all its resources. It was made timid, even cowardly by its failures. It depended upon artificial management for its continuance, and when skill had made its desperate changes with no result but loss and chagrin, there remained no mental power to give vitality to courage. True courage is an element only of goodness. Chance, with its cold fatality withered all hope of good luck, and strategy had lost its cunning. James and his party—had lost all control by a rigid adherence to a false theory, and from the mistakes of theory, they were hurried by the impulses of passion from error to error, from crime to crime, from treason to treason,—until the mind in its desperation but wanted—

"another push
To leap from its hinges."

Protestantism could find no cause in itself for this terrible accumulation of evils,—and charged all to Popery. In view of its opponents Popery rejoiced in the comfort of the same assurance.³ The same logic served both, and neither could see truth or safety in the other. The line of succession was changed, and Papists were made ineligible to the throne of England forever. This conclusion was simply wise because it was the will of the nation. The nation was more Protestant than Catholic,—and it was entitled to religious freedom.⁴ The conclusion was not a remedy because

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. v, p. 111.

² Smyth, *Modern Hist.*, pp. 250, 251, 252.

³ Buckle says, "In spite of the difference of their religion, the English clergy had always displayed an affection towards James, whose reverence for the priesthood they greatly admired; though they were anxious that the warmth of his affection should be lavished on the Church of England, and not on the Church of Rome."—

Hist. of Gov. in England, Vol. i, p. 263.

⁴ According to a computation given by Cooke, made in the next reign, the *Freeholders* throughout England were estimated upon an average, as

Conformists to non-con-	
formists,	224-5 to 1
Conformists to papists, 1781-18 to 1	
Conformists and non-con-	
formists to papists, ..	1862-3 to 1

James was a Catholic, but because the people were Protestants. Neither Catholicism nor Protestantism insures a good government. It may exist under either or both. A wise civil polity alone can give religious freedom. The choice of William, in principle, made the crown elective.¹ In other words, when a hereditary Prince violates the constitution of his country,—the people are entitled to act in direct view of their own rights and protection. This is democracy. It was understood by William. He said plainly to the democratic leaders, that “They might have a regent, no doubt, if they thought proper, but he would not be that regent; they might wish him, perhaps, to reign in right, and during the lifetime of his wife, but he would submit to nothing of the sort; and he should certainly, in either case, return to Holland, and leave them to settle their government in any manner they thought best.” Such was his only course. To commence an administration with no certainty of ending it; to inaugurate a policy with no guaranty for its continuance or security—would jeopard his character and give him an uncertain record. He was careful not to assume power without knowing what was the voice of the people, and the deliberate action of Parliament. It was, indeed, an appeal to the people, and it established forever the importance of the Commons. But, without enlarging on this interesting period,—a few words are due to the reign of William and Mary.

WILLIAM AND MARY.

To comprehend the democracy of William, it is only necessary to study the spirit of his reign, to compare his early acts with his last. He had many difficulties to encounter, and to decide upon a line that should divide his friends from his enemies was not the least. That the democrats

At this time the numbers of the non-conformists were probably somewhat increased, and those of the papists diminished. This computation, however, included but a small portion of the residents in towns, and it was among these that the spirit of dissent chiefly prevailed.—*Hist. of Party*, VOL. I, p. 449.

¹ The benefits of the revolution are thus stated by Prof. Smyth:—“First the line of succession was departed from, and it was declared that no Papist should reign; Popery was therefore escaped. Secondly, William was made King, though it was his wife, not himself, who was next in succession, William, therefore, was considered as

elected. The right, therefore, of the community, in particular cases, to interfere with the disposal of the executive power, and even of the crown itself, was exercised and admitted. Thirdly, before the crown was conferred, as a preliminary part of the ceremony, the opportunity was taken, which had not been taken at the Restoration, of making some provision for the future security of the constitution, and certain rights and liberties were claimed, demanded, and insisted upon, as the undoubted rights and liberties of the people of England. The constitution was, therefore, renewed and confirmed.”—*Mod. Hist.*, p. 350.

would be selected as his advisers, at first, was expected—for he had adopted their views and declared their principles. That he was not influenced by party prejudice may be inferred from the fact that he lost no opportunity to conciliate his opponents, and to urge a Bill of Indemnity. With a war upon his hands during most of his reign, and with a troublesome faction threatening the security of the throne—he had but little time to study the ordinary wants of his people, or to meet them. He felt that if his mission was as important as it was declared to be by the voice of the nation—there was no good reason why his friends should not promptly respond to his wishes, as to revenue. The Democrats were deemed too prudent to be just, too mean to be generous. Having risked his life to save the nation from misrule, it was unjust that he should be embarrassed for the want of means to conclude a patriotic enterprise which had been so cheaply and successfully commenced. In his moments of disappointment, it was not singular that he should make a comparison between the Democrats and Tories. The Tories were not slow in making the most of their opportunities to deceive the King by promising all the means he asked,—in the hope that they would gain his confidence and thus secure to themselves, what they valued more than money, political position and influence. He had not tested the Tories either as men, or politicians. He had known the party as connected with the government, but was probably unable to decide in what degree they had shared its responsibilities with the king. If they had erred, to what extent had they been misled? Were they ignorant, or had they been deceived? The country was new to him, the people were strangers. Public men of all parties were forward to greet the Prince with friendly and earnest protestations of favor and coöperation,—and it would be difficult for him to discriminate between these offers of service, or to show an undue preference. It was obvious what his first choice would be,—and no one was disappointed when the Democrats were called as his advisers. But, after his administration had been entered upon, and he had had opportunities not only to judge of men, but of measures, he was doubtless led by the plausible address of the Tories, and by their cunning bids for influence,—to treat their advances at first with courtesy, and afterwards with favor. They certainly had seen enough of error to be able to esteem truth a privilege.

Men, as men, approach each other with ordinary motives of sociality, and they are usually impressed by circumstances of social position, and personal associations. They form acquaintances with more or less prejudice, and contract likes or dislikes according to circumstances. This is particularly true of political partisans. Sometimes a bitter partisan is an agreeable companion socially, and if such a companion has power to exert, or influence to command,—he is often able to control the man before the politician. Confident in his own convictions, William was slow to suspect

deceit in others. He was honest and frank, and he possessed the true courage of duty. Conclusions were followed by action. A prompt spirit welcomes a prompt spirit. A concurring mind gladdens its associate, and when persons readily agree on one subject, they are in a fair way to agree upon others. Sentiment leads the intellect. This is sympathy. William was disposed to think well of men who professed to think well of him—irrespective of party. He wanted what the Democrats were slow to grant, and when this was seen by the Tories they were quick to offer unconditional support. This had the effect to give him confidence in the justice of his requisitions, and to lead him to congratulate himself in the cheering fact that he had friends in supposed opponents. His impatience hastened his conclusions, and he trusted the Tories before he developed their capacity for treachery. He was slow to discover the difference between a dissenting friend and a concurring enemy.¹ The one had honest motives to convince by opposing, the other dishonest motives to deceive by pretending to agree. Mere party men study the man—measure his talents, note his peculiarities, his weaknesses,—and find out his plans, his wishes, and his wants. Each has its nature to be gratified or complimented, and a knowledge of each is a power of control. The Tories did not hesitate to bow to William,—but their submission to his rule did not preclude their hope even in James.² If

¹ William soon found, says Dalrymple, that "his crown was encircled with thorns." In promoting his elevation, the Tories departed from all their established maxims. They could not resist the current upon which they had floated, nor could they divest themselves of their natural instincts which still made them his political opponents. Of the seven prelates who had been persecuted by the late king, only one, the bishop of Asaph, was willing to take the oaths to support the new monarch. When Mary sent to ask Sancroft's blessing, the ungracious reply of the Archbishop was, "that she must ask her father's first, otherwise his would not be heard in heaven."

² These hopes were not only willingly indulged by a few high Tories, but they were encouraged by James, even to the last. His "concessions," says Macaulay, "were meant only to blind the lords and the nation to the king's real designs. He had secretly determined that, even in this extremity, he would yield nothing. On the very day on which he issued the proclamation of amnes-

ty, he fully explained his intentions to Barillon. 'This negotiation,' said James, 'is a mere feint. I must send commissioners to my nephew, that I may gain time to ship off my wife and the Prince of Wales. You know the temper of my troops. None but the Irish will stand by me; and the Irish are not in sufficient force to resist the enemy. A Parliament would impose upon me conditions which I could not endure. I should be forced to undo all that I have done for the Catholics, and to break with the King of France. As soon, therefore, as the queen and my child are safe, I will leave England, and take refuge in Ireland, in Scotland, or with your master.'"—See *Hist. of Eng.*, Vol. II, p. 486, and *Dalrymple's Memoirs*. "That a legitimate and powerful monarch," says Cooke, "should descend from his throne without a blow, and fly before the first outcry of popular indignation, was an event too sudden to appear lasting; and the preparations of Louis, and the temporary success which attended James in Ireland, rendered res-

they could succeed in controlling William they had no desire to help the return of James. Their principle of action was management, in other words—to procure legitimate ends by illegitimate means. William desired to serve his country, but they studied how their country might be made to serve them. He wanted means to do good; they were ready to supply them provided his good might be made to serve their wishes. He attempted coalition, but he found that equality in opposing powers gave no product. It amounted to inaction, neutrality. His wants led him to be charitable in his judgment,—for they promised him what he wanted,—and this was more than he could get from Democrats. Thus from time to time, in his administration, he allowed himself to be deceived by the Tories, and it was not until he had been misled several times by their treachery that he saw that they were not to be trusted under any circumstances.¹ They were constantly at work to circumvent his measures, and even to degrade him from the throne. His credulity impaired the confidence of his party friends, and it was with difficulty that he could persuade them to rescue him from extreme perils when tempted to wander from the high standard of democracy.

William, as a statesman, was in advance of his time, and yet there was a limit to his visions of practicability. His knowledge was inadequate to his principles. The science of government in its applications was a new subject to him. He was not sufficiently informed respecting the history of Great Britain to be able to do full justice either to her Colonies or to Ireland. His political friends approached him on these subjects with an assumed confidence that secured his assent to measures more in deference to their expressed opinions, than as deliberate conclusions of his own judgment. He approved the continued injustice to Ireland. He was doubtless led into this error by the assurances of Tyroconnel, the Lord Lieutenant.²

When it was proposed to extend the Bill of Rights to the American Colonies, he vetoed the measure. A colony was regarded as a state in its minority—requiring paternal care, and special supervision. Rights were to be conferred, not conveyed; given, not claimed. “The state papers demonstrate,” says Chalmers, “that the most renowned jurists of the reign.

toration an event which was contemplated as highly probable by all. The parties were agreed in admitting the probability, but acted very differently under their belief.”—Chapter XVIII, Vol. I, p. 518, of *Hist. of Party* is interesting.

¹ It was not until near the end of William's reign that he became fully convinced that the Tories were unreliable. At this time, Cooke says, “The Tories were now unpopular in the nation, and distrusted by the

King. Upon his return to England William dissolved the Parliament, and made advances to the Whigs. Somers received the overture with suspicion, and asked what security his friends had that he would not return to the same ill advisers. “Never, never,” replied the king, with an emphasis which denoted his thorough conviction of his error.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 540.

² See Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, Vol. I, pp. 330, 334.

of William had formed no complete conception of the nature of the connective principle between the parent country and her colonies; of the extent of the royal prerogative as applied to the government of each, while the jurisdiction of Parliament was by all admitted to be co-extensive with the boundaries of the empire. Contrary to the Declaration of Rights, Chief Justice Holt advised his sovereign to assume the government of Maryland on a supposed necessity, without any form of law, with whom, however, afterward concurred Sir Edward Northey and Sir Simon Harcourt. Sir Thomas Trevor doubted how far the Marylanders were entitled to the benefit of the Great Charter. The most respectable cabinet which William III. ever enjoyed, composed of Lords Somers, Pembroke, Shrewsbury, Bridgewater, Romney, Godolphin, and Sir William Trumbull, denied to the new English the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, because it had never been conferred on the colonists by any King of England, plainly supposing that the most important of all rights, the best security of personal liberty, must result from a grant of the crown to a subject beyond the ocean. Mr. Locke, with other philosophers, solemnly advised that prince to appoint a captain general over the colonies, with dictatorial power to levy and command an army without their own consent, or even the approbation of Parliament." That the advice was not approved shows how great was the wisdom of the prince.

The policy of William, in Europe, subjected the colonies to cruel wars, and loaded them with heavy debts. Colonial neutrality was rejected by William, though favored by the French Court, and this was a course suited to the ambition of the northern colonies in their conscious strength and ability to add to their domains. The spirit of conquest was as natural to the colonists, as the love of rule to the fatherland.

The reign of William was one of expensive extension. Ireland was to be subdued and Scotland adjusted. This course of action had been commenced. It was now hardly regarded as one of inquiry. Popery was an ally to the one, and Presbyterianism to the other. The English nation began to realize its parts, and to study the means of unity. The sources of its strength were opened, and its conventional power assumed in an imposing form which commanded respect abroad, and gave confidence at home. It was in a condition to begin to understand its own wants,—and to see the necessity of being able to defend itself against the ambitious schemes of other nations. It was inevitable in such a period of early formation, that the power of money should be linked with the power of man. The want of character was made good by money, and the want of money was made good by character. Government must have money,—and it became in some degree a currency for influence, title and position. It was bribery, but bribery was then a substitute for destruction, the poor privilege of choosing the lesser evil. If the king submitted to the degrading

conditions of bribery, where no higher conditions were available, he certainly had the merit of confining corruption within the limits of his own kingdom. He improved upon the sad examples of Charles the Second and James the Second in not selling the freedom of his government to the King of France. It was his difficult part to break off the servile connection between the two countries, and to battle with the disappointment and chagrin of a monarch whose wounded pride was added to the workings of his unholy ambition.

William had so extended the responsibilities of the nation,—that while he increased its dignity and power—he was compelled to accept such instrumentalities to advance his cause as society then afforded. The wants of society were above and beyond its character, and what was wanting in moral power was made up in material aid. The great debt of England was here commenced, and if its history were to be written,—it would be substantially the history of the nation. A currency of a people affords an instructive index to their character and condition during the period of its use. As a Democrat, William was responsible for all that was practicable during his reign, but not for the character of the age in which he lived. In one respect he was superior to the colonists. They passed a penal law against witchcraft. He vetoed it. This was a superstition in an outward community—beyond the sea. He saw and understood the weakness, and he did not hesitate to apply the remedy.

The revolution of 1688, was a splendid triumph of Democracy.¹ It

¹“It must be carefully noticed,” says Prof. Smyth, “that, though the Bill of Rights might not propose itself as any alteration, it was certainly a complete renovation, of the free constitution of England. The abject state to which the laws, the constitution, and the people themselves had fallen must never be forgotten; and it then can surely not be denied that this public assertion, on a sudden, this establishment and enactment, of all the great leading principles of a free government fairly deserves the appellation which it has always received, of the Revolution of 1688.

“It is very material to observe, that the Declaration and enactment were *totally on the popular side*, were declaratory entirely and exclusively of the rights and liberties of the people, in no respect of the prerogatives of the crown. The Bill of Rights was, in fact, a new Magna Charta,—a new Petition of Right,—a new enrolment of the pre-

rogatives, if I may so speak, of the *democratic part of the constitution*, which, though consented to by William, an elected prince, and perhaps even thought necessary to his own justification and security, could only have been extorted by force from any reigning hereditary monarch, and in point of fact, was certainly not procured by the English nation, on this occasion, till the regular possessor of the crown had ceased to wear it, and till the country had appeared in a state of positive and successful resistance to his authority. It must always be remembered, that, through the whole of these proceedings, there was an acknowledgment and a practical exhibition of the great popular doctrine, that all government, and all the forms and provisions which are necessary to its administration, must ultimately be referred to the happiness of the people.”—*Modern Hist.*, Vol. 1, p. 352.

placed the throne of England on the solid foundations of principle. The people were recognized as the true source of political power and government. The king was made the servant of the people, and his continued right to wear the crown was made to depend upon his faithfulness to the constitution. These changes were democratic—and in them the nation found a remedy for its evils which no time can change, no circumstance can alter—except in application. The remedy was Justice and Equal Rights, and just to the extent of application to a suffering people—with a wise regard to their capacity and condition, the remedy afforded relief. The immediate period succeeding a revolution is one of pause, of rest and preparation. The parts of the government are to be adjusted one to another, and all are to be adapted to the wants and condition of the people. The people, as subjects, as citizens, as laborers, as artisans, as parties, as sects, as societies, as institutions, as governments, as nations—are to be educated anew—that the higher duties may be seen and understood. The Church and State, politics and religion are to be advanced with an increased sincerity, a superior wisdom. The nation is to be studied in its new centre, and in its new relations—both at home and abroad. It is not a period of display—but of self-duty. Such were the duties of William—and the period of his reign was too short to enable him to realize the glory of his achievements. He saw the tree in its beauty of foliage, in its vigor of growth, but not in its bloom and bearing. The natural elements of his character were those of a democratic reformer. He was impatient of wrong. He was quick to see an evil, he was impatient at stupidity. He was always ready to act, he was impatient at delay. He comprehended the dignity of principle and the greatness of duty; he was impatient of ceremony and trifles. He was accused of being insensible to the refinements of society. But with him, to be a gentleman was less gratifying than to be a patriot. No one would doubt, that to be both would have been still better. But men are to be estimated according to what they are, and not according to what an author may wish to make them.¹

In giving the results of this democratic revolution, which was accomplished without battle or bloodshed—injustice would be done both to the subject and to the reader—if a passage full of truth were to be omitted

¹ Even the Duchess of Marlborough failed to discover the true character of William. In speaking of him, she says, "I could fill as many sheets as I have already written, with relating the brutalities that were done to the Prince and Princess in this reign. The King was, indeed, so ill-natured, and so little polished by education, that neither in great things nor in small had he the manners of a gentleman." —*Conduct*, p. 116. Prince George was not permitted to appear at court on the royal birthday—in deep mourning—although it was almost immediately after the death of his brother, the King of Denmark. A worthy mayor of a borough presented to the king

from Macaulay. The compliment to Democracy of a monarchist is of higher authority than from a democrat of a republic.

He says,—“The Declaration of Right, though it made nothing law which had not been law before, contained the germ of the law which gave religious freedom to the Dissenter, of the law which secured the independence of the judges, of the law which limited the duration of Parliaments, of the law which placed the liberty of the press under the protection of juries, of the law which prohibited the slave trade, of the law which abolished the sacramental test, of the law which relieved the Roman Catholics from civil disabilities, of the law which reformed the representative system, of every good law which has been passed during a hundred and sixty years, of every good law which may hereafter, in the course of ages, be found necessary to promote the public weal, and to satisfy the demands of public opinion.”

“The highest eulogy which can be pronounced on the revolution of 1688 is this, that it was our last revolution. Several generations have now passed away since any wise and patriotic Englishman has meditated resistance to the established government. In all honest and reflecting minds there is a conviction, daily strengthened by experience, that the means of effecting every improvement which the Constitution requires may be found within the Constitution itself.” * * * “For the authority of law, for the security of property, for the peace of our streets, for the happiness of our homes, our gratitude is due, under Him who raises and pulls down nations at His pleasure, to the Long Parliament, to the Convention, and to William of Orange.”¹

Much more that is interesting, might be added respecting the Prince of Orange, but enough has been said to show that though monarchy and royalty in themselves represent nothing more than nominal distinctions in the mere forms of government, they acquire legitimate glory whenever they are associated with the adoption and practice of democratic principles.

In historical order, on the death of William, we have a new and different subject in the reign and character of his successor to the throne, a Tory Queen, the Princess Anne of Denmark, the daughter of James the Second.

QUEEN ANNE.

On the failure of the issue of her sister Mary, Lady Anne, wife of Prince

at court an address, “combining the two dissimilar topics of condolence for the death of the queen, and congratulation for the success of Namur.” He introduced himself by saying that he came with joy in one hand and grief in the other. “Pray put them

both into one hand, good Mr. Mayor,” was the king’s laconic remark.—*Thompson’s Memoirs of the Duchess of Marlborough*, Vol. I, p. 260.

¹ Hist. of England, Vol. II, pp. 615, 616, 617.

George of Denmark, was declared successor to the crown. This was in 1702. It was a great change in almost every particular, and it may not be without profit to study its meaning.

However desirable it may be to have gifted statesmen to establish a government on a solid basis, and to administer it with skill and wisdom, and in strict conformity to a constitutional standard, still, it cannot be denied that an occasional change, from great to moderate ability is attended with some advantages which could not be derived from an unbroken continuance of undiminished proficiency in statesmanship. Greatness in human capacity has its limits, its appointed cycles of energy and triumphs, its errors and failures,—and great mistakes are not without their teachings. Such changes need not, and cannot be devised, as parts of a system, for they are inevitable in the nature of things. Their causes inhere in the nature of man, in the structure of society, and when the laws of progress are studied, a great source of truth is opened to the common mind which otherwise would be closed to the world. As man cannot improve the rule of Providence, it is wise that he should endeavor to understand its lessons. A strong man cannot always lead, for society is not always in a condition to follow. If great men were always in the ascendancy, most men would remain weak for the want of opportunity to increase their strength by exercise. The masses are not to be advanced and elevated by the mere agency of language,—but by the humble endeavors of the comparatively weak who not only represent a class in action, but gradually acquire an experience which enables them more fully to understand the science of government, and the examples of a superior practice. Each and every class in society has its representative, and the philosophy of differences is taught by the varying examples of practice, and associated with sympathies as extensive as the workings of the human mind in its illimitable combinations of capacity, sentiment and passion.

The death of William was a just cause of alarm to the Whigs and Dissenters, for they knew the dangers of Tory rule both to themselves and to the nation. The Tories did not openly rejoice in the event of his death, as they did in France and Rome, but their manifestations of gladness were clearly to be seen in their congratulations of change.¹ The Queen, though she “promised sweetly” to all who addressed her with loyal affection, yet, her promises amounted to but little, as they were made with a very imperfect knowledge of the means to redeem them.

At the time of her accession to the throne, Anne was thirty-seven years of age. Of a moderate capacity, she was hardly capable of distinguishing between opinions and prejudices. “She had been educated,” says Cooke, “among the high church Tories, and she had imbibed a sincere, almost super-

¹ See Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, pp. 7, 8, 9, 10.

stitious veneration for the church.¹ She had been taught that the Whigs were republicans and dissenters—enemies to the establishment, and subverters of the monarchy: her own experience had confirmed her in this belief.² In her contest with William for an independent revenue, these had been her enemies; the Tories had then proved themselves her friends.”³ She had been married to Prince George, of Denmark, who was equal to her condition of weakness, if not in title. Together, they had been led by designing Tories to indulge in personal resentments against the late king and his administration, rather than by prudent counsels to prepare them for grave and public duties. This early teaching was understood by partisans, for with her predilections for the church she saw duty only, where they cared only for party. In her pious mood she called them the “church party,” and when the Commons spoke of her “unparalleled goodness,” in diverting a portion of her revenue to the public service, she could not but feel gratified by their just and delicate sense of her wants and wishes. If the queen did not write her own speeches, it was natural that her ministers should give her language suited rather to the delicacy of woman than to the sterner qualities of man. For the same reason the addresses of Parliament to the throne would be characterized by a spirit of gallantry, which, if it did not do justice to the queen, would do no injustice to the woman.⁴ She was made to compliment William, and to deplore his death as a calamity to the nation; and yet, when she spoke of her “own heart as entirely English,” it was certainly an ungracious allusion to his foreign origin.⁵ It was amusing, not to say instructive, to read her maternal admonitions to her Parliament, to “avoid

¹ In respect to the Church, the Duchess of Marlborough says,—“For my own part, the word ‘church,’ had never any charm for me in the mouths of those who made the most noise with it, for I could not perceive that they gave any other distinguished proof of their regard for the thing than a frequent use of the word, like a spell to enchant weak minds, and a persecuting zeal against dissenters, and against those real friends of the church who would not admit that persecution was agreeable to its doctrine; and as to state affairs, many of these churchmen appeared to me to have no fixed principles at all, having endeavored, during the last reign, to undermine that very government which they had contributed to establish.”—*Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough*, p. 122.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. vi, p. 1.

³ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 542.

⁴ Her sense of decorum was so nice, that, on her accession to the throne, she caused the bust of herself on the gold coin to be clothed as it was, according to ancient custom, on the silver. Nothing offended her, as queen, so much as a breach of the customary observances. Lord Bolingbroke having visited her one day in haste, in a Ramillie tie, she remarked “that she supposed his lordship would soon come to court in his night-cap.”—*Thomson’s Duchess of Marlboro’*, Vol. I, p. 57. *Granger*. Her letters to her sister, the Princess of Orange, however, respecting the birth of the infant prince, do not show much innate refinement.—See *Dalrymple’s Memoirs*, Appendix.

⁵ Parl. Deb., Vol. vi, p. 5.

all heats and divisions," and then to listen to the inevitable echoes of hardenest politicians who were infinitely more concerned for their party than either for her majesty or the nation. "The queen did not openly interpose in the elections," says Burnet, "but her inclinations to the Tories appearing plainly, all people took it for granted that she wished they might be the majority. This wrought on the inconstancy, and servility, that is natural to multitudes: and the conceits which had been infused and propagated with much industry, that the Whigs had charged the nation with great taxes, of which a large share had been devoured by themselves, had so far turned the tide, that the Tories in this House of Commons were at least double the number of the Whigs. They met full of fury against the memory of the late King, and against those who had been employed by him."

The moment the Tories gained the ascendancy, they began to persecute the dissenters. The occasional conformity bill was introduced in the Commons, and after much discussion was passed by a large majority. The Tories attempted to give the impression that it was the Queen's bill. She was at a loss, probably, whether to own it or not, as her husband was an occasional conformer.¹ "I can't bear saying," she writes to the Duchess of Marlborough, "that I see nothing like persecution in this bill. You may think it is a notion Lord Nottingham put into my head, but upon my word it is my own thought." If so, it was certainly a very rebellious thought, as she declares in the same letter, that although she "wished it then to pass she would have been very glad if it had not been brought into the House of Commons."²

During the reign of William the House of Peers was controlled by the Whigs. "Although the creations upon the accession of Anne," says Cooke, "had been four to one in favor of the Tories, the Whigs still had a majority in the Lords. The occasional conformity bill was, therefore, very differently received in that house to what it had been in the Commons. The Lords supplied those words of form, by the omission of which the Tories had attempted to stigmatize the memory of William; they rejected the clause which affected corporate officers, they inserted several provisions favorable to the dissenters; and reduced the penalties to a more moderate scale."³

Lord Bolingbroke pronounced the Schism Bill to be "of the last impor-

¹ By the Test Act 1672, all who held offices of trust, or were magistrates in corporations, were compelled to take the sacrament, according to the rite of the Church of England, before they entered upon their offices; these were called occasional con-

formers. The Queen's husband, Prince George of Denmark, was one:—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 549.

² *Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 550.

³ See *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VI, p. 65.

lance, since it concerned the security of the Church of England, the best and firmest support of the monarchy.”¹ It was the remark of the Earl of Anglesea,—“That the dissenters were equally dangerous both to the Church and State.”² It was suggested by the Bishop of London,—“That the dissenters had made this bill necessary, by their endeavors to propagate their schism, and to draw the children of the churchmen to their schools and academies.”³ Lord Halifax urged, “That the very bringing in of this bill was injurious to the queen, and he could not believe her majesty would ever give her royal assent to such a law after the solemn declaration she had made from the throne, that she would inviolably maintain the toleration, which the bill visibly struck at.”⁴ The Earl of Wharton was quite disposed to be facetious on the men of pleasure who gravely announced their deep concern that the church was in danger. “It is somewhat strange,” said he, “they should call schism in England what is the established religion in Scotland; and therefore, if the lords who represented the nobility of that part of Great Britain, were for this bill, he hoped, that, in order to be even with us, and consistent with themselves, they would move for the bringing in another bill, to prevent the growth of schism in their own country.”⁵ As an amendment was made afterwards to include Ireland, another bill might have been made with the same propriety to guard Catholicism in that country. After some amendments were made abating the penalties, the bill was passed in the Lords seventy-seven to seventy-two, and in the Commons one hundred and sixty-three to ninety-eight.

In her appointments the Queen favored the Tories,⁶ though she was influenced to retain most of the judges and Foreign Ministers. None, however, were retained who were not explicitly committed to the war against France and Spain.⁷ The Tories “so immaculate in opposition,” so disinterestedly opposed to place or emolument, now became eager petitioners even for the smallest offices. “The Whigs,” says Cooke, “did not fail to remind these patriotic men of their self-denying resolve, and all were not so happy in their cases, or so cute in their casuistry, as Mr. How, who could answer to such an unpleasant allusion that ‘he had kept his word, he had not a place,’—a plea which was, doubtless, literally true, since the office of paymaster-general was divided between him and Mr. Fox.”⁸

The extreme measures of the Tory ministry, and of the Tory Commons,

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1351.

² Ibid, p. 1352.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1354.

⁴ Ibid, p. 1353.

⁵ Ibid, p. 1352.

⁶ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 545.

⁷ Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 15.

⁸ This Mr. John How was one of the most violent members of his party; he was seated for Gloucestershire, in the next Parliament, by a most shameless and unconstitutional decision of the Tory majority of an election committee.—*Admission. Hist. of Party*, Vol. I p. 547.

which was dissolved in 1705, disgusted the nation. Moderate Whigs and Tories were found ready to unite in the belief that a strong administration could be formed by a coalition of parties. Bolingbroke was then young and ambitious. "Panting for political distinction, he saw in this alliance the earliest prospect of promotion and he embraced it."¹ The victories of the war had made the war popular with the nation, and the Tories had made their ascendancy still more hateful by their great reluctance to grant supplies. The despotic conduct of the Commons, in the case of the Aylesbury election compelled the Queen to prorogue it. The proclamation which followed, only anticipated by a short time, its natural dissolution.²

The elections for the new Parliament were attended with much excitement. The Tories uttered their usual party cry,—“The Church is in danger,” and they were met with a confident spirit by their opponents with the question,—“Is the Church in danger?” For a wonder the court was neutral. In conflict with principle royalty is no element of power. The Whigs were victorious, and the Tories were placed in opposition. The question,—“Is the Church in danger?”—was early discussed by the new Parliament and emphatically decided in the negative.³

“The nation,” said Lord Somers in this debate, “is now happy under a most wise and just administration, the public money is justly applied, the public credit in the highest esteem, the armies and fleets are supplied, the success of her majesty’s arms gives the nation greater honor and reputation than has before been known, and we have a fair prospect of bringing the war to a happy conclusion. Those men who raise groundless jealousies in this position of affairs, can mean no less than to embroil us at home, and defeat all our glorious designs abroad.”⁴

The Tories introduced a bill against religious freedom in Ireland, but it was voted down in the Commons by a majority of seventy-six. The Act of Union with Scotland was passed, and with but little opposition. This was followed by other judicious measures, suited to the wants of that country, highly creditable to the administration. In 1705, in a speech from the throne on the subject of a more perfect union with Scotland, the Queen said,—“I am persuaded that an union between the two kingdoms will not only prevent many inconveniencies, which may otherwise happen, but conduce to the peace and happiness of both nations; and therefore I hope I shall have your assistance in bringing this great work to a good conclusion.” The opportunity to speak of the importance of union was too good

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 545.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 559.

³ The Duchess of Marlborough thought that the Church could be in no immediate

danger with such a “nursing mother” as the Queen. The Tories called her “the illustrious ornament of the church.”

⁴ Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 499.

to be lost, and she added,—“ There is another union I think myself obliged to recommend to you in the most earnest and affectionate manner ; I mean an union of minds and affections amongst ourselves.” In the House of Lords, 1713, the Earl of Finlater spoke of the grievances of Scotland, and concluded by saying, “ That, since the union between the two nations had not those good effects as were expected and hoped from it, when it was made, he therefore moved,—“ That leave might be given to bring a Bill for dissolving the said union, and securing the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover, the Queen’s prerogative in both kingdoms, and preserving an entire unity and good correspondence between the two kingdoms.” The motion was seconded by the Earl of Marr, and favored by the Duke of Argyle, the Earl of Nottingham, and others, and opposed by the Earl of Peterboro’, and by the Lord Treasurer. Some other Scottish Peers urged, “ That the end of the union was the amity and friendship between the two nations, but it was so far from having that effect, that they were sure the animosities between the two nations, were much greater now than before the union. That it might easily be proved by many instances, that some persons agreed better when they were asunder, than when together ; and for that reason they believed, if the Union were dissolved again, the two nations would be like to be better friends.”¹ The Court Lords were all against dissolving the Union, and said, “ that the very moving such a thing was dangerous, and might be of ill consequence, and therefore desired that such an effectual stop might be put to it, as that none might offer at any such thing again.”²

The subject of political union was but little understood. It is difficult to say what meaning the ministers intended to have the queen convey in her language, the “ union of minds and affections,”—unless it was similar to that between husband and wife, where the wife is required to promise obedience. And yet, when Parliament gravely intimated to the queen, after the death of her husband, that she “ would not so far indulge in her just grief as to decline the thoughts of a second marriage, that her people might have the unspeakable joy of joining in most fervent prayers to Almighty God to bless her majesty with issue,”³ she was evidently disposed to think that Parliament could not aid her in the formation of such a union. “ The subject of this address is of such a nature,” said she, “ that I am persuaded you do not expect a particular answer.”⁴ This was well understood by Mary, when she gave the crown to the Prince of Orange.

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. vi, p. 1218.

³ Though frequently pregnant, this blessing

² The motion of the Earl of Finlater was carried in the negative only by four voices.

ing had not been bestowed upon her.

⁴ Parl. Deb., Vol. vi, p. 778.

—*Ibid*, p. 1219.

At that time marriage was an "union of mind and affections," and with but few rights. Marital rights have been increased with civilization. Political union without rights is an absurdity. It is no more than a nominal promise. This truth has been painfully illustrated in the experience of England, Scotland and Ireland. Union, of any kind, strictly implies equality of parts. It illustrates harmony. The strings of a harp, and the pipes of an organ are made separately, and each is made perfect in itself,—before all can be united in harmony by tuning. The union of the three kingdoms of Great Britain is still "much out of tune," to employ a phrase familiar to musicians, and the statesmen of that enlightened country are still inquiring with an apparent amazement why they cannot secure harmony by discordant legislation! So long as they have a discriminating policy to trust one kingdom more than another, to honor one kingdom more than another, to demand a special loyalty from one, that is not required of all alike, they provide for disunion, and it would be a miracle if they did not have it.

The dogmas of theology still divided the political world, and each party recognized a standard of principle in religious belief. When all lament the excesses of party strife, there is a relief to be found in the great fact that Infinite wisdom is virtually acknowledged where ignorance and superstition are permitted to rule and ruin. Conformity was regarded as an indispensable element for the good of society, and as might was leagued with opinion,—government was subjected to all the embarrassments of absurdity and change. If the Tories were willing to perpetuate their absurdities by prosecuting the Bishop of Asaph for his manly language and patriotic sentiments, it must be confessed that it was a greater error of the Whigs to proceed against Dr. Sacheverell¹ who was a bold advocate of fallacies which had been publicly condemned and by all parties.

This has been termed the Augustan age of English literature. The administration of Harley was distinguished for its literary talent. Bolingbroke, Atterbury, Friend, King, Prior and Swift—were among its supporters. The Whig cause was honored by the names of Addison, Steele, Burnet, Congreve, Rowe, and others. "The Examiner," a political daily paper, was put forth as the organ of the new government. "The Whig Examiner," commenced by Addison and others, and then "Manwayring's Medley," successively became the organs of the opposition. "The excitement which the contests of these papers occasioned," says Cooke, "drew within its vortex those more delicate offspring of the periodical press, whose light essays were hitherto confined to the reformation of social man-

¹ The Sermons of Dr. Sacheverell, and interesting account of debate in Parl. Deb., Bishop of Asaph, of opposite parties, were Vol. VI, p. 806, and p. 1152. ordered to be burnt, by Parliament. See

ners, and the promotion of refinement and taste. The elegance of thought and diction which had been cultivated as an attractive garb to the moral lesson, was now rendered subservient to more exciting objects; it gave dignity and polish to the eulogy of a party, and added pungency to the political satire. "The Tatler" quickly swerved from its appointed course. Steele, its editor, who despised the prudence of a placeman, and Addison, who had no such tie to restrain him, ventured to match their little painted bark against opponents which had been purposely constructed for conflict." ¹ The "Tatler" was more especially designed for the ladies. The reader will doubtless remember its playful touches at political parties, in one of which, the writer deprecates "the prevalence of party spirit among his fair readers, and marking its power by the whimsical instance, that it had caused the Whig and Tory ladies to show their hostility, and avow their party, by wearing their patches upon different cheeks." ²

The alliance of literature with politics served to give dignity and refinement to political discussion, and this not without advantage to the government. Still, the keen thrusts of the opposition were too much for the patience of the administration. What could not be met by successful argument, was met by ill-timed resorts to force. "No one," says Cooke, "was a more vigilant prosecutor of Whig pamphleteers than St. John, yet it is curious to observe Swift, the greatest libeller of his age, complaining of his inactivity in that respect." ³

The event of Sir Richard Steele's expulsion from the Commons is one of the most interesting and instructive in the reign of Queen Anne. He was an active democrat, and his great power as a writer distinguished him above ordinary partisans. His language was bold, and yet there was a refinement about it that belonged only to the utterances of truth, and a force, that could come only from knowledge and a superior judgment. It was as much as the Tories could endure to have such a writer in the kingdom, to say nothing of his presence in the House of Commons. It was, however, most likely a subject of congratulation among the Tories that he was elected a member, because his influence might be lessened by expulsion. Not that he had uttered disloyal language, or had violated any law,—for such acts were deemed wrong only when against their party. He had spoken the truth against the Tory party when in its weakness, and when truth was a cruelty. Much important information with respect to the times of that period, and party struggles,—may be gathered from his "Apology"

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 583.

² This trivial instance may illustrate the strength and universality of party hostility during the reign of Anne. It must not be forgotten that the influence of the "Exam-

iner," the "Medley," or the "Tatler," bore no analogy to that of a modern newspaper. —*Ibid*, p. 584.

³ Hist. of Party, Vol. I, p. 585..

addressed to Mr. Walpole.¹ His points are clearly stated, his style is elegant, and his conclusions are apt and logical. His manner of presenting a subject is at once so comprehensive and captivating, that the reader is at a loss to decide which is entitled to the greater admiration, the beauty of the truths which he utters, or the language which he employs to convey them. His views are so logically expressed that they afford a key not only to the nature of the political contests of the day, but of those nice and delicate shades of opinion which mark the boundaries of differences, as flowers mark the landscape.

Mr. Steele was elected but a few months before the death of the Queen, though no man was more opposed by the court and the Tories. He had attacked their measures with great boldness and effect, and he was a favorite with the Whig party. It was early determined by the ministers that his expulsion was a party necessity. A petition was filed against his election, but as it was the seventeenth, of more than an hundred of that kind to be heard, they adopted a plan to obviate delay. It was resolved to adopt a summary way of reaching him, by attacking his political writings as seditious, and dangerous to the nation. Mr. Hungerford, a noted lawyer, who had been expelled the House of Commons for bribery in the reign of King William,—on the 11th of March, moved to take into consideration that part of the Queen's speech which related to the suppressing seditious libels; and complained, in particular, of several scandalous papers lately published under the name of Richard Steele, Esq., a member of that house. He was seconded by Mr. Auditor Foley, a near relation to the Lord Treasurer, who suggested,—“That unless means were found to restrain the licentiousness of the press, and to shelter those who had the honor to be in the administration, from malicious and scandalous libels; they, who by their abilities are best qualified to serve their Queen and country, would decline public office and employments.”² This was supported by Sir William Wyndham, who added,—“That some of Mr. Steele's writings contained insolent and injurious reflections on the Queen herself, and were dictated by a spirit of rebellion.” The next day, Auditor Harley (the Lord Treasurer's brother) made a formal complaint to the House against certain paragraphs of three printed pamphlets, which had given most offence to the court:—“The Englishman,” of Jan. 19th; the “Crisis,” and the last “Englishman,” all said to be written by Richard Steele, Esq., which pamphlets being brought up to the table, it was ordered,—“That Mr. Steele should attend in his place the next morning.”

At the appointed time Mr. Steele was at the House, and several of the paragraphs complained of, were read, and severely animadverted upon by

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1275.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1286.

Mr. Foley, Mr. Harley and others. They were denounced as seditious. A member attempted to speak in Mr. Steele's behalf, intimating "that according to the order of the day, Mr. Steele was to be heard himself in his place," but there was so much noise and confusion he could not proceed. Upon this, Mr. Steele said,—“That being attacked on several heads without any previous notice, he hoped the house would allow him, at least, a week's time to prepare for his defence.” This was Saturday, and Auditor Harley, true to the instincts of his party, objected to so long a delay, and moved that they should give him till Monday following. That is, one day, and that day was Sunday. Mr. Steele, not unwilling to ridicule his two principal prosecutors, Foley and Harley, who were known to be rigid Presbyterians, though they now sided with the High Church, assumed their sanctified countenance, and confessed, “in the weakness and contrition of his heart, that he was a very great sinner; and hoped the member who spoke last, and who was so justly renowned for his exemplary piety and devotion, would not be accessory to the number of his transgressions, by obliging him to break the Sabbath of the Lord, by perusing such profane writings, as might serve for his justification.” This speech, spoken in a canting tone, put most of the members in good humor, and his request for time was granted. As several of the Whig members were absent, this delay was favorable to their return before the expiration of the week. That he might be prepared to meet his accusers with respect to his allusions to Dunkirk, he moved,—“That an Address be presented to the Queen to give directions, that the several representatives of her engineers and officers, who had the care and inspection of the demolition of Dunkirk, and all orders and instructions given thereupon be laid before the House.”¹ This motion was rejected by two hundred and fourteen voices against one hundred and nine. Of course, when a party assumes to be the government, truth and information are not wanted, unless to subserve the party in power.

On the 18th day of March, 1714, the day appointed for Steele's trial, it was moved by Mr. Auditor Foley, that before they proceeded further, Mr. Steele should declare whether he acknowledged the writings that bore his name. Mr. Steele admitted, that “he wrote and published the said pamphlets, and the several paragraphs there, which had been complained of and read to the House, with the same cheerfulness and satisfaction, with which he had abjured the Pretender.” It was then ordered that he should withdraw; but after some debate, it was decided, without a division, that he should remain in order to make his defence.² He desired that he might

¹ See Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1271.

² In a letter to Congreve, March 19, Pope

writes:—“Yesterday Mr. Steele's affair was decided.” * * * “This gentleman

be allowed to answer to what might be urged against him, paragraph by paragraph. He was powerfully supported by Robert Walpole, Gen. Stanhope, Lord Finch, eldest son to the Earl of Nottingham, and the Lord Hinchinbrook, son to the Earl of Sandwich, yet it was insisted by his accusers, and it was voted—"That he should proceed to make his defence, generally, upon the charge given against him." Accordingly, in this he proceeded, being assisted by Joseph Addison, who sat near him. For nearly three hours he spoke upon the passages which had been made the basis of his arraignment, and "with such a temper, modesty, unconcern, easy and manly eloquence, as gave entire satisfaction to all, who were not inveterately prepossessed against him." After closing, he was required to withdraw. It was generally expected that Auditor Foley would have summed up, and answered his defence, paragraph by paragraph, but he simply remarked,—“That, without amusing the House with long speeches, it was plain that the writings that had been complained of, were seditious and scandalous, injurious to her majesty’s government, the church, and the universities, and moved that the question should be put thereupon.” This motion, though designed to embarrass the accused, was entirely consistent with the intolerant and desperate spirit that led to the prosecution. The Tories did not ask for justice. This they feared. The debate was an exciting one, and was continued till near midnight. Walpole was the first to speak, and he defended Steele with great ability and eloquence. He asked,—“Why the author was answerable in Parliament for the things which he wrote in his private capacity? And if he is punishable by law, why is he not left to the law? By this mode of proceeding, Parliament, which used to be the scourge only of evil ministers, is made by ministers the scourge of the subject.” * * * “Shall Parliament assume the ungracious part of thus inferring guilt from mere arbitrary construction? If they do, what advantage to government or the community can be expected to result from such a measure? Are doctrines refuted, and truths suppressed, by being censured or stigmatized?” * * * “The liberty of the press is unrestrained; how then shall a part of the legislature dare to punish that as a crime which is not declared to be so by any law, framed by the whole? And why should that House be made the instrument of such a detestable purpose?”¹ Walpole was followed by his brother Horatio, on the same side. Lord Finch was the next to speak, and though able and

among a thousand others, is a great instance of the fate of all who are carried away by party spirit of any side. I wish all violence may succeed as ill; but am really amazed that so much of that sour and pernicious quality should be joined with so

much natural good humour as I think Mr. Steele is possessed of.”—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. vi, p. 1819. Steele was earnest but not violent.

¹ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. vi, p. 1269.

eloquent, he became embarrassed. His natural modesty, and his deference for the assembly before which he had not been accustomed to speak, deprived him of his usual self-possession, and he sat down in visible confusion, saying, loud enough to be over-heard,—“It is strange I can’t speak for this man, though I could readily fight for him.” His words being whispered from one to another, operated in an instant like electrical fire; and a sudden burst from all parts of the House, of “Hear him! hear him!” with ineffable marks of encouragement, brought Lord Finch again on his legs, who with astonishing recollection, and the utmost propriety, uttered a speech on the occasion, in which, “there was not a word which did not tell.” “He expressed himself,” says a writer of the period, “with a magnanimity and clearness, proceeding from the integrity of his heart, that made his very adversaries receive him as a man they wished their friend.”¹

Lord Finch justified Mr. Steele in his reflections on the Peace. “We may,” said he, “call it honorable; but I am sure it is accounted scandalous in Holland, Germany, Portugal, and all over Europe except France and Spain. We may call it advantageous, but all the trading part of the nation find it to be otherwise: and if it be really advantageous, it must be so to the ministers that made it.” Sir Wm. Wyndham remarked,—“That the ministry would not say that the Peace was advantageous to them.” To which Lord Finch quickly replied,—“Then it was plain it was advantageous to nobody but our late enemies.”

Lord Finch was followed by Lord Lumley, Lord Hinchinbrook, and others with much spirit; but facts were offensive, and arguments were unheeded by a large majority of the House. Mr. Auditor Foley, Sir. Wm. Wyndham, the Attorney General, and other party leaders insisted on the question being taken on the resolution to expel Mr. Steele. This was done by a vote of two hundred and forty-five to one hundred and fifty-two.² Shortly after his expulsion, Mr. Steele published a defence of his conduct, addressed to Mr. Walpole. It was entitled, “Mr. Steele’s Apology for Himself and his Writings, occasioned by his Expulsion from the House of Commons. *Fabula Quanta Fui.*” This masterly effort was a valuable contribution to the cause of freedom, and it is entitled to particular consideration.³

William, it has been truly said, was king only to the Whigs.⁴ He favored

¹ See Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1273.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1274.

³ It will be found in Parl. Deb., Vol. VI, p. 1275.

⁴ Hardly as he had sometimes treated the Whigs, the Tories hated the man to whom they bowed, and William had been only the

monarch of the Whigs. It was they alone who placed the crown upon his head, and they alone who kept it there.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 548. It was said, that the Earl of Nottingham, whose spirit of expediency was only surpassed by the solemnity of his manners,—exerted his influ-

no faction. That is, he placed the government upon a democratic basis, and enabled the people to see and understand the principles of democracy in their practical application. The Whigs could justly and reasonably exult in the success of their cause. They were at no loss to understand the means by which it was secured. Their faith and practice were in harmony, and their promises were redeemed. Their fairest hopes were realized. The Tories were ready to share the blessings of a democratic policy, though they were slow to acknowledge their origin. They could but see the merit and great ability of the late King, but they preferred to associate his name with royalty and good luck, rather than with democracy and its legitimate benefits. They admitted his rule, because they could not do without it, but with no purpose to approve his principles, or to endorse his party. He was their king only as he was the chosen king of the nation where they lived, but not the king of their party.¹ Democracy is not partisanship. It is truth and duty to the people. The administration of William gave such a direction to public affairs, that it was impossible suddenly to turn them into new channels. It was like a train of cars detached from the engine, moving from an impetus already given, but not exhausted. To a certain extent Anne had no choice but to submit to this legacy of power bequeathed by William. She was powerless to resist the revolutionary tide that lifted up the people to the dignity of citizenship. She could only indulge in her Tory proclivities to seek counsellors who were willing to believe one way, and to administer the government another. The revolution had placed the nation beyond the reach of mere party.² It was moved by the tide of principle, and for a time, ceased to be disturbed by faction. It was a period of rest, in which the constitution was tested and established. Theorists were active as partisans, and selfish partisans stud-

ence to prejudice William against the Whigs, and to some extent he succeeded. Nottingham was ambitious to be at the head of the church party. His affected gravity and solemn deportment were found to constitute his chief merit. He was one of the *many-sided* partisans—who are always ready with great dignity to serve their country with disinterested boldness, provided they are not asked to be consistent with themselves. He is thus spoken of by Swift:—"Lord Nottingham, a famous Tory and speech-maker, is gone over to the Whig side; they toast him daily, and Lord Wharton says, it is *Dismal*, (so they call him from his looks) will save England at

last."—*Correspondence*, VOL. XV, p. 73. See *Thomson's Duchess of Marlboro'*, VOL. I, p. 184; and VOL. II, p. 245.

¹ Coxe says,—“When William entrusted the management of affairs to the Tories, he hoped that the change would give stability to his government. But the event did not accord with his expectations.” * * *

“The Whigs, though hated in power, became the favorites of the nation, when in disgrace.”—*Memoirs*, VOL. I, p. 71.

² In the disposition of church preferment, the queen consulted her own partialities, and these were generally adverse to the Whigs, the friends of the revolution.—See *Coxe's Memoirs*, VOL. II, pp. 90, 91.

ied their means of vile advantage, but they had no power to annul the blessings which had been achieved.

A feeble woman, for such a period, proved to be a safer ruler than would have been an able but ambitious statesman. Knowledge when linked with inordinate ambition permits no rest. It is impatient in its doubtful experiments, and by pushing its measures prevents a healthy growth. Anne's superstitious reverence for the Church, and unlimited confidence in the Tories, rendered her incapable of discriminating differences. At times, she favored both parties in turn, but rather by the accidents of influence, than from deliberate judgment. Her reign appeared to be one of confusion, because there could be no definite policy where mind was not free to control, and where party spirit could not openly pursue a course consistent with its own designs. Where small minds have the prerogative occasionally to lead, and great minds are under the necessity of following, incongruities are inevitable. With such a general as Marlborough, and such counsellors as Bolingbroke, Cowper, Godolphin, and Harley,¹ plotting with Mrs. Masham,² and

¹ Harley is often called in the Whig pamphlets and ballads, "*the trickster*." Sunderland inveighed bitterly against the duplicity of Harley. He regarded him as "the author of all the tricks played here."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 35.

² Mrs. Abigail Hill was a humble relation of the Duchess of Marlborough. By her influence she was appointed one of the bed-chamber women of the Queen. The aid thus extended to the family of Mrs. Hill was highly creditable to the Duchess. Of humble position and without income, of ordinary capacity, except for ungrateful cunning, Mrs. Hill soon acquired sufficient influence with the Queen to supplant her kindred benefactress. It is said that she favored the Stuarts against the House of Hanover, the Tories against the Whigs, and High Church. When she witnessed the frequent altercations between the Duchess and the Queen,—she did not hesitate to compete for influence. By adapting herself to the Queen's peculiarities, and flattering her opinions and weaknesses—she accomplished her ends. By the Queen's approbation she was married to a Mr. Masham, a relation of Harley. This marriage was permitted to take place without the knowledge of the Duchess,—thus showing conclusively that

she was regarded by the Queen as a successful rival of the Duchess in the royal confidence. Thus installed—she became a power at court. She became a party tool of the Queen, the Tories, and the church, and an active agent against the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, and the Whigs. She even had the influence to secure military appointments of her own family, against precedent, and against the earnest protests of the Duke of Marlborough. She and Harley became the chief managers in the disposition of political favors. Lady Sunderland, (daughter of Lord Marlborough) thus alludes to her:—"I dare say nothing will ever be right, but the removing her; and if that can't be, I hope she will join the Tories, and not with the Whigs, and then it won't be in their power to ruin all the world when there is a peace."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. III, p. 76.

In a letter to the Duchess of Marlborough, Nov. 1, 1709, the Duke says,—"I am of opinion that my letter will make no alteration in the Queen. However, I assure you that I am very well pleased that I have acquainted her with my mind. I believe her easiness to Lord Sunderland proceeds from her being told that she can't do other than go on with the Whigs; but be assured

all subject to the modifications of the Duchess of Marlborough,—it would, indeed, be marvellous if the government were administered with consistency, or with much reference to principle.

The unanimity of the Whigs and Tories in prosecuting the war against France, was secured by a common sentiment of hostility to that country, and by the necessity of a Protestant succession. The return of the exiled family was the great question of the revolution to be reconsidered and decided, not by treaty, nor by legislation, but by the uncertain events of war, and with a Catholic country. War, to be successful, must command the undivided energies of a nation. To have a people united in its vigorous prosecution, and divided in their domestic policy, is a most unfortunate condition of things. The government suffers because its means are impaired by party necessities, and parties become desperate because of their inability to contribute to the absolute needs of government. What should be guided and determined by the axioms of war, are often left to be directed by a reckless ambition, or to the incidents of incapacity. An incompetent general is promoted because he is willing to conform to the programme of party, and the skilful commander disgraced because he is too honest to connect politics with legitimate warfare. Marlborough was too much of a hero to neglect the conditions of victory, and too much of a patriot to evade responsibility where its assumption became necessary to the public safety. He was too much of a warrior to know when to make peace, and too little of a statesman to know how to make peace. It was Bolingbroke's part to satisfy the Queen that she had no abler adviser, and to watch the doings of Marlborough, that he might appropriate his successes for the benefit of the party he was ambitious to revive and strengthen.¹ The allies increased

that Mrs. Masham and Mr. Harley will, under-hand, do everything that can make the business uneasy, and particularly to you, the Lord Treasurer, and me; for they know very well that if we were removed, everything would be in their power."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 484. For interesting accounts of Mrs. Masham, see *Coxe's Memoirs*, Volumes II and III, and Mrs. Thomson's *Duchess of Marlborough*.

¹ Coxe says,—“We find Secretary St. John adopting towards him (Marlborough) a dictatorial language, and imperious tone, to which he had been hitherto unaccustomed, and which was the more mortifying because it proceeded from one whom he had fostered as a son, and had introduced into office, and whose interest he had promoted

with so much zeal as even to excite the disapprobation of his most intimate friends.”

* * * “In his interview with Mr. Secretary St. John, the general was treated with much petulance and reproof, under the affectation of candor and frankness. He was compelled to listen to a political lecture on the difference between the Whigs and Tories, and to hear the most unqualified remonstrances on the impolicy of abandoning his former friends for his recent connections.”—*Memoirs*, Vol. III, pp. 150, 164, 174. He was rebuked for leaving the Tories, and sympathizing with the Whigs. He was even told “that his true interest consisted in getting rid of his wife, who was grown to be irreconcilable with the queen, as soon as he could, and

their demands as they became victorious, and the war changed from the defensive to the aggressive. This is a common error when the military spirit predominates, and it becomes the gravest question for the consideration of statesmen, how far war is to be carried before peace is to be regarded a sacred duty. War is a condition of injustice, whether the belligerents see it or not, and peace is inevitable when justice prevails. Peace is the cause of the world, in its highest moral condition; and war, under all circumstances, is an evil that should be removed at the earliest practicable moment. Not at the expense of great public interests which require a permanent basis to insure a reasonable prosperity, nor at the sacrifice of honor which would open the door to further insults incompatible with a self-protecting dignity. A nation cannot long exist if it be reckless of character,—for without principle and a commendable pride, it would have no just motive to protect itself by extreme measures. A sensitive national honor, a vigilant jealousy, are healthful conditions indispensable to sovereignty and to the exercise of true patriotism in the administration of government. But these conditions are not incompatible with compromise and concession. Magnanimity is the virtue of power, and the greater the power that nobly concedes forfeited rights, or forgives surrendered weakness,—the greater is the glory of victory. When Louis proposed peace, it was an acknowledgment of error before the world. It was either a confession of weakness, or a radical change of purpose. Either was entitled to grave consideration, but the allies manifested a culpable indifference as to terms. Success had rendered them impracticable. It is true, the war involved mixed issues, and the parties to it were influenced by varying interests, and different motives. The peace of Europe, was the chief object of the “Grand Alliance,” and yet when liberal terms were offered by Louis, each party urged a special claim, and all were so earnest to use their power because they had it, to command advantages not before contemplated, that a settlement became impossible.

Power uninfluenced by moral principle in correspondence with its own magnitude, is naturally oppressive. It seizes and holds what it has the power to hold. If exerted by an individual in the limited relations of society,—he makes for himself a hateful character. If exerted by a nation, it is a policy of to-day, but fatal for to-morrow. The grasping disposition of unregulated power, overacts to its own loss. By attempting too much, it is made to yield that which it has. It creates a sympathy for the unjust party, if that party is oppressed in its feebleness, or is denied a reasonable

with the best grace he could.”—*Coxe's* bring great things in principle down to their *Memoirs*, Vol. III, p. 178. It was the level. struggle of small things in authority to

settlement. A mean, or narrow policy is expensive to a nation, because it lessens its power. The generous treatment of an enemy makes him your friend, and this principle in the exercise of power is the element of success and strength in a nation. The greater the power the greater the beneficent results.

Louis saw that peace was a necessity, and that his resources were becoming exhausted,¹ that his subjects were despondent, and that his only chance for self-justification was to offer honorable terms, such as he had been unwilling to give before, but such as the Allies would have taken. Their rejection placed him in the right who had been wrong before, and the Allies, who had been right, were now in the wrong. Louis gained strength at home and abroad. Not by stating what he had done, or tried to do, in the past, but by making known what he was willing to do to-day. It was no answer that his assurances of sincerity were to be questioned, for national honor cannot be properly linked with suspected duplicity. Suspicion in diplomacy is beneath the dignity of a great nation. National greatness implies the ability not only to defend its own honor, but to chastise the want of it in others. Louis was ambitious and unscrupulous in the employment of means to accomplish his ends, but he was not ignorant of human nature, nor was he indifferent to those high qualities of mind which constitute the amenities of life. If he indulged in dreams of extravagant extensions of power, and saw no disgrace in the dissipations of the court, it could not be said that he was either stupid in the choice of his means to accomplish his ends, or foolish in the application of them. When he saw that the allies had become unprincipled enemies, instead of remaining independent powers seeking to establish the peace of Europe on just foundations, and as such, were receding from their original demands as to questionable rights, and were disposed to make new claims as they increased in power, he did not hesitate to place himself before his people, and the world, in a new attitude, that of honorable self-defence. "If it depended on me," he said in a public address to his subjects, "you should have enjoyed this blessing which you so earnestly desire, the blessing of peace; but it must be procured by new efforts; the immense sacrifices I have offered are of no avail. I can perfectly sympathize with all that my faithful subjects must endure, but I am persuaded they would themselves recoil from conditions of peace as repugnant to justice as to the honor of the French name." Whatever may be said of the exaggeration

¹ At the close of the campaign of 1708 France lay feeble and prostrate, like the bloodless corpse of a mighty giant; her youth and manhood had been destroyed in the war, and her treasure had been lavished as wastefully as her blood; the plough had been abandoned for the sword, and famine followed to complete the measure of her misery.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. 1, p. 572.

not to say the misrepresentation of facts of Louis, respecting the objects of his great sacrifices, there was enough of truth in his language to excite the sympathy, and to arouse the sensitive pride of the nation. The history of this war is but another illustration of the truth, which is not as yet sufficiently understood,—that those who make war are incapable of making peace.

By rejecting peace, the Whigs became anti-democratic in their policy. They gradually and justly lost their power. What they lost was gained by the Tories. A Tory ministry was gladly formed by the Queen, and a peace was soon concluded, much to the satisfaction of Louis if not to the allies. If the Whigs were culpable in not accepting the terms of Louis, which were liberal and honorable, the Tories were still more censurable for consenting to conditions which were disgraceful.¹ To consent to such a peace was equivalent to condemning the war, as the results secured were in utter disproportion to the expenditures of blood, treasure and domestic comfort. But, while this period was marked by some of the smallest minds, it was also distinguished by some of the greatest. When extremes meet in character, it becomes a profitable lesson to study the laws of moral and political equilibrium.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH.

The Great Duke of Marlborough, as he has been recorded in history, was the military power of the nation during the reign of Anne. Without him, the results of the war would have been doubtful. It is not wise to speculate upon the contingencies of the past, when all know that the past is unalterable. Though man is but a feeble instrument in the events of

¹ "The whole transaction," says Coxe, "was clandestinely managed between Torcey and the British ministers, through the agency of Mesnager, who accompanied Prior on his return to England. On the 27th of September (1711) the preliminaries, founded on the basis of the seven articles, were signed by Mesnager, on the part of France, and by the two Secretaries of State, in virtue of a warrant from the queen. In this dishonorable instrument the only specific propositions were the acknowledgment of the queen's title and the Protestant succession by the King of France, and his engagement to take all just and reasonable measures that the crowns of France and Spain should never be united

on the head of the same Prince, from a persuasion that this excess of power would be contrary to the good and quiet of Europe. Thus with a single stroke of the pen, was overturned the leading principle of the grand alliance, that no Bourbon Prince should ever fill the throne of Spain." Although the queen had promised, "that she would carry on the negotiation in concurrence with the States, no official communications were made to the republic for several months after the delivery of the preliminary articles proposed by the French court." * * * "These preliminaries were received in Holland with universal indignation."—*Memoirs*, Vol. III, p. 252.

progress, yet, it is difficult to see how the independence of England could have been saved, or the peace of Europe secured, without the agency of such a man as Marlborough. It is not left to man to decide what might have been had Marlborough never been born; but to look upon the events of that period as they actually transpired, including him as a part, as a power, in the age which he helped to characterize. No man is a power by himself. He is either aided by others, in harmony, or opposed by others, in opinion or policy. He is not permitted to control his nativity, to elect his compatriots, nor to compose the elements which constitute the times in which he lives. He finds himself a part of society which is subjected to conditions independent of individual motives or action. In these, he finds himself not only linked with others, who each has a distinct and responsible part to perform, but with duties which, though not self-sought, are regarded as peculiarly his own.

There could be but little profit in studying the character of Marlborough in scenes of supposed differences. To ask what he would have been without the favor of the Duchess of Cleveland, without the love of Sarah Jennings, without the cunning and duplicity of a Bolingbroke, or a Harley, or a Mrs. Masham? With a sovereign of larger capacity than that of Queen Anne, or with a minister weaker than Godolphin? It is not profitable to individualize men, except so far as a particular knowledge is indispensable to an accurate knowledge of the society, or the times, of which they constitute a part. Like all other men, Marlborough was only one of many, and made what he really was not only by his own peculiar powers, but by what the many really were who lived in his time.

The greatness of man is not seen without man's weakness. It is either limited by special incapacity, or by the want of special knowledge.¹ Society is made up of great and little men together,—and it is the business of history to estimate their separate, as well as their aggregated forces. Strong men have their weaknesses, and weak men their redeeming qualities,—and all have their respective parts to perform, however great, or however humble. It has been said that “The defects of great men are the consolation of dunces,”² and it is a saying of the Talmud, “That when men put a monkey into power they must bow to him.” Bodin asserted in the 16th century that “much knowledge is generally mischievous in a king.

¹ Montaigne says,—“Homer was compelled to consent that Venus, so sweet and delicate as she was, should be wounded at the battle of Troy, thereby to ascribe courage and boldness to her; qualities that cannot possibly be in those who are exempt from danger. The gods are made to be

angry, to fear, to run away, to be jealous, to grieve, and to be transported with passion, to honor them with the virtues that amongst us are built upon these imperfections.—*Essays*, p. 451.

² D'ISRAELI'S *Curiosities of Literature*.

It is rarely united with a good disposition, and with a moral discipline of mind: None of the Emperors were so illiterate as Trajan, none more learned than Nero."¹ Such sayings only show what has been in the past, and clearly indicate what is deemed possible in the future, but it does not follow, that what consoles a dunce can really lessen the dignity of character, or that the people of any nation can long deceive themselves in mistaking a monkey for a man, or in preferring ignorance to knowledge. Lord Bacon could clearly comprehend the profoundest truth, but he could not always master the meanest motive. Sir Isaac Newton could contemplate with mathematical accuracy the phenomena of the physical universe, but he was sometimes blind to the commonest error. Lord Chatham saw with wonderful power the justice of the colonial cause of America, and while he could picture, with unsurpassed eloquence the sources of strength and glory of the British Empire, he failed to see the republican means of greatness in the wilderness beyond the sea. Lord Byron could mark and interpret the beauties of mind in its flights and perfections, but he was without the humble power of self-denial to save himself from misery. Cicero, in his greatness, did not disguise his love of glory, and the younger Pliny modestly confesses the love of fame to be a commendable passion, "in one who being conscious of no guile, is not afraid to be remembered by posterity."² Franklin did not deem it beneath his dignity to justify "self-praise," and he counted vanity a common friend.³ So that weakness is not without a place in Providence, nor the want of wisdom without its use.

Whatever may be the achievements of the intellect, the heart is not without its influence to increase, to lessen, or to modify them. The greatness of Marlborough appeared to be exempted from the sway of the passions which ordinarily characterize an ambitious man. His amiableness of temper admirably fitted him for all the graces of charity, and gave him that enduring patience so necessary to a loyal heart that recognizes a sovereign, however weak or stupid. His reverence for royalty neutralized his disgust for the petty shifts and expedients of weakness. His deep and undeviating affection for his wife became an anchor to his character, and saved him from the polluting atmosphere of a dissolute age. His love for her seemed to embrace all the promises of his highest ambition. His public achievements were constantly centred in the one hope that his means of independence, and the privilege of retirement from official duty, would be shared with his "dear wife, his soul of soul."

In discussing the character, positions and influence of great men, if we

¹ Hallam's *Lit. of Europe*, Vol. II, p. 182.

² *Spectator*, No. 554.

³ *Sparks' Franklin*, Vol. VII. p. 52.

would do full justice to their motives and avoid excesses of praise, it is necessary to have exact views of their compatriots. Men often acquire distinction by what is done by others. Without a special knowledge of the weakness that indulges in envy or jealousy, or the essential aids derived from a subordinated superiority, we fail to discover the true sources of greatness, seen in grand results, and are liable to disparage merit, and to over-estimate character.

"When things follow their natural laws," says Guizot, "when external force does not mix itself up with them, power always flies to the most capable, to the best, to those who will lead society towards its aim." Nothing can be more certain, and yet when the obstructions to the natural laws are estimated, and the elements of external force are excluded from the proposition, nothing can be more uncertain. When "omnipotence and imbecility are joined," to quote the extravagant language of Lord Chatham, all the circumstances of society, the principal features of the age—become elements which enter into all estimates of public character. The successful administration of government, whether in peace, or war, depends much upon a judicious distribution of power among individuals. When strong men are joined with weak, or when weak officials constitute the government, and the strong are only advisers, whose counsels may be received or rejected, it is difficult to adapt means to ends, or to foresee and provide for disturbing causes which are likely to arise from such unnatural combinations. This inequality of human agency is inevitable in the nature of things, and it is the part of wisdom prudently to provide for it. The ancients saw no remedy but in ostracism.¹ But this remedy was abolished when applied to disreputable persons. "The ostracism," says Plutarch, "was not a punishment for crimes and misdemeanors, but was very decently called an humbling and lessening of some excessive influence and power. In reality, it was a mild gratification of envy; for by this means, whoever was offended at the growing greatness of another, discharged his spleen, not in anything cruel or inhuman, but only in voting a ten years' banishment. But when it once began to fall upon mean and profligate persons,

¹ *Ostracism* is from the Greek word *ostrakon*, an oyster; a mode of proscription at Athens. This custom is said to have been first introduced by the tyrant Hippias; by others it is ascribed to Clisthenes, about 510 B. C. It is thus explained by Plutarch: "Every citizen took a piece of broken pot, or shell, on which he wrote the name of the person he wanted to have banished, and carried it to a part of the market-place that

was enclosed with wooden rails. The magistrates then counted the number of shells; and if it amounted not to six thousand, the ostracism stood for nothing; if it did, they sorted the shells, and the person whose name was found on the greatest number was declared an exile for ten years, but with permission to enjoy his estate."—*Lives*, VOL. II, p. 109.

it was ever after entirely laid aside, Hyperbulus (a miserable wretch) being the last that was exiled by it."¹

The mythological character of HERCULES is invested with all those elements of power which are naturally associated with the excesses of interest, or passion, and checks and balances are provided necessary to harmony and protection. The myth of Hercules was obviously designed as a creation of power to illustrate irresistible physical strength, and yet not without particular reference to the demands of human nature, to science and the arts, and to the normal conditions of society. His person was represented as naked, of fine proportions, and undisguised by art. He was early instructed in the liberal arts, and taught with extraordinary care all the accomplishments calculated to refine the mind, or to strengthen the body. When but an infant, his hands were superior to the muscular power of the monstrous serpents sent to destroy him, and his maturer strength mastered the lion without the aid of arms. He was permitted to enjoy the highest privileges of society, and yet was subjected to the ordinary trials of life. It was seen that such a creation of individual power would be fatal to the peace of society, and he was subjected to restraints altogether incompatible with the exercise of super-human capacities. He was led to rebel against his own destiny, to indulge in unholy passions, and was made to suffer the extreme penalties due to crime, and to be sold as a slave. His wickedness was made to give him new positions of power, and his slavery was ended by the hand of his admiring mistress in the bonds of matrimony. The jealousy of Juno was combined with the will of Jupiter to subject Hercules to the power of Eurystheus even before his birth.² All the gods united to arm Hercules, to constitute him a champion without an equal, and yet when he was ordered to capture, unhurt, the stag so famous for its swiftness,—Diana was clothed with the power to seize the animal in defence of her prerogative, and to stipulate terms of compromise. With all his physical strength he was not permitted to succeed without strategy, and the aid of science. To utterly destroy the Lernean hydra he had to employ his friend Iolas to burn, with a hot iron, the root of the head which he had crushed to pieces, and he was unable to capture the stag without the ambushed trap. The eleventh labor imposed upon Hercules by Eurystheus, to obtain apples from

¹ Plutarch's Lives, Vol. II, p. 109.

² Eurystheus, a king of Argos and Mycenæ, son of Sthenelus and Nicippe, the daughter of Pelops. Juno hastened his birth by two months, that he might come into the world before Hercules the son of Alcmena, as the younger of the two was doomed by the order of Jupiter, to be subservient to the will of the other. This natural right was cruelly exercised by Eurystheus, who was jealous of the fame of Hercules; and who, to destroy so powerful a relation, imposed upon him the most dangerous and uncommon enterprises, well known by the name of the twelve labors of Hercules.—*Lemprière*.

the garden of the Hesperides, was nothing less than rebellion against the source of his own power,—but all this was made consistent by Minerva, who carried the apples back because they could be preserved in no other place. So of the dog Cerberus, after surprising him and dragging him to the earth, and complying with the terms of the order, he returned him to his post, as diplomatists would say,—*in statu quo ante bellum*. With all his power to overcome others, however strong, he was finally made a victim by Dejanira, a jealous wife, and by the revenge of Nessus. Thus, the greatest embodiment of mental and physical power, as understood by the ancients, was subjected to the extremest tests, and ended with frightful successes, and humiliating failures. He was introduced into the world, a hero above men and monsters,—and yet the arrow prepared by himself for his enemies, that poisoned the blood of Nessus, was made to poison his own. In vain he attempted to save himself, “and in the midst of his pains and tortures he inveighed in the most bitter imprecations against the credulous Dejanira, the cruelty of Eurystheus, and the jealousy and hatred of Juno.” Jupiter, inspired, one would suppose by wisdom not unlike that of modern times, saw no way to end such a character, but to make him a martyr, and placed him among the gods.

Such a hero is out of place in the world, where no equals are prepared to balance his power, or to compete with his skill. His capacity for good was almost entirely devoted to the reduction of evils removable only by physical strength, and his capacity for evil was limited by the obvious necessities of society. The philosophy of the myth, is similar to that of Providence as given by modern writers. A power too great for the general good of society is left to be corrected by its own inherent weakness. An element of failure is provided to check the excesses of success.

This subject of inequality, whether in distinct and separate departments of government, as defined by a constitution, or in the individuals who compose the aggregate of official authority; or, in the majorities and minorities of the people marked by their votes on public questions,—is one of great magnitude, and cannot be over-estimated. The wisdom, or the weakness, the knowledge, or the ignorance, the integrity, or the dishonesty of public men, is a constant theme of remark throughout the world, and it is often difficult to determine whether men are more influenced by truth and intelligence, than duped by cunning, or led by interest. Men, too unfavorably known to be trusted, sometimes succeed in their perfidious plans,—by making tools of others. But this subject will be more particularly discussed in another place.

The Duke of Marlborough was the most prominent character of his age. As a warrior he had no equal, and more than any other man, he was the leading statesman of the Grand Alliance, and the Prime Minister of England, during the reign of Anne. Such a character becomes, as it were,

a central power in the world, and is practically linked with the principal events of its period. It is connected not only with events, to which it gives birth or controls, but with individuals who have strength to aid, or weakness to embarrass. He was the Hercules of his time, but he had his Eurystheus in the Tory party, in the Church, and in the sovereignty of the Crown. These were combined as one power. Early taught and guided by a clergyman distinguished for his learning and piety, he doubtless "imbibed that deep sense of religion, and zealous attachment to the Church of England, which were never obliterated amidst the dissipation of a Court, the cares of political business, or the din of arms."¹ His ardent attachment to the Church prepared him for the conflict with Popery. He did not oppose Popery, by denying freedom of opinion to Papists, but he justly claimed the same protection for a Protestant that he was willing to grant to a Catholic. He was no friend to persecution. He indulged in no doubts as to religious duty or loyalty.² He served his God and his country with a singleness of purpose that precluded all encroachments upon his time that was dedicated to duty. With a single eye to public affairs he was able to comprehend the wants of nations, and to mark out a policy in outline with precision and accuracy. He could foresee general results, although not always able to explain them. As a statesman, he studied nations rather in their aggregated relations, than in their political details of men and measures. His amiable credulity, his deep sense of religious obligations, his passionate loyalty,—all enabled him to concentrate his undivided energies upon great subjects and general issues,—but he was not prepared to scrutinize either the motives of men, or to detect their cunning means of management. In military affairs, his conceptions of successful action were wonderful. To him armies were seen as simple powers, combined with astonishing rapidity and precision in successful attack, and mastered with unparalleled skill in defence. His battles were characterized occasionally with an apparent indifference to life, and had he not succeeded in his impetuous movements, he would have been justly denounced heartless as a man, and reckless as a general.³ His early exploits attracted the attention of distinguished generals, and he was not without honor from royalty. Turenne called him his "handsome Englishman."⁴ He possessed the

¹ Coxe's *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 1.

² In a letter to the Prince of Orange, Aug. 4, 1688, Marlborough says,—“Mr. Sidney will let you know how I intend to behave myself. I think it is what I owe to my God and my country. My honor I take leave to put into your highness's hands, in which I think it safe. If you think there is anything else that I ought to do, you

have but to command me; I shall pay entire obedience to it, being resolved to die in that religion that it has pleased God to give you both the will and the power to protect.”—Coxe's *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 21.

³ Coxe's *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 504.

⁴ Coxe's *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, pp. 4, 29.

⁵ A lieutenant-colonel having scandalously abandoned, without resistance, a station

happy faculty of adapting himself to the varying elements of character always to be found in the proud and sensitive nature of military men. Having to do with every variety of nationality, it was important that he should clearly understand their peculiar claims to notice, or promotion, their prejudices and interests, their habits and principles. Although enjoying a position almost above the spirit of competition, yet he was not entirely exempted from the malice of envy, nor from the cabalistic schemes of ambitious men. But few men in history, have occupied high positions of unquestioned influence with less selfishness, or with more efficiency. If he indulged in an inordinate passion for wealth as some assert, he certainly had the high merit of not disregarding legitimate precedents, and he was not guilty of that much greater sin of ambition, of attempting to consolidate powers of state at the expense of personal freedom, and of the general welfare. It was with evident pain that he felt constrained to detach himself from James II., and to favor the cause of revolution. Both his motives and his honor have been questioned, in this connection, when, perhaps, a little further inquiry might discover a measure of merit rather than of censure. True loyalty is not adherence to the personage of the king, nor to his name, but to the constitution which invests the royal personage with legitimate sovereignty. While he saw danger in James, and safety in the Prince of Orange,—he was not above a compassionate friendship for the one, nor below the demands of patriotism to support the other. Had Marlborough been influenced to acquire political power regardless of loyalty and patriotic duty, and with chief reference to ultimate political ascendancy; with his genius and skill, with his *prestige* and information,—he could have easily accomplished for himself a rule as enduring as that of Cromwell, and a sway as wide as that of Napoleon.

But, it seemed to be the highest ambition of Marlborough, to serve his country as he found it, as he had been taught to know it, to hold sacred its constitution, to obey its laws, and to honor its institutions. In his opinions, habits and tastes he was conservative. He saw no safety but in a constitutional government,—where he could look for a supreme authority to protect the rights of the British subject everywhere, and to assert and defend the dignity of the nation in its proud sovereignty. He was no fanatic, no revolutionist. He lived in revolutionary times, but it was not his mission to add to their troubles. He looked upon the soldier only as a servant to the Crown, and exerted his skill as a diplomatist only for the

which he was enjoined to defend to the last extremity, Turenne exclaimed,—“I will bet a supper and a dozen of claret, that my handsome Englishman will recover the post, with half the number of men that the officer commanded who has lost it.” The wager was instantly accepted, and the event justified the confidence of the general.—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 4.

good of his country. It became his duty to guard the peace of Europe against the machinations of the most powerful monarch of the world. When his "name became a watchword of fear," in France, and when he was honored with unlimited authority to represent and promote the separate and combined interests of the Grand Alliance; to speak for the sovereigns of his own country, of Spain, Germany, Holland and Sweden,—he regarded his duties only as a sacred trust. The highest tokens of parliamentary respect and confidence, the most flattering considerations of royalty, and court distinctions, created in him no desire for increased power and personal influence,—but discovered in his language "only the modest dignity of a great mind."¹ He would give "a thousand lives,"² to the service of the Queen if patriotism demanded the sacrifice. Whatever happened adverse to his purposes, whether to contravene his plans, or to traduce his character, by "turning his services into crimes,"³ nothing was permitted to disturb his equanimity, or to tempt him to disregard his sense of public duty. His reverential submission to what he deemed to be the will of God,—was never allowed to be associated with doubt or levity.⁴ He assumed no questionable power, under the plea of military necessity. Too much cannot be said in commendation of his undeviating respect for the civil authority at all times as superior to the military. His loyalty was of no doubtful

¹ "The queen rejoiced," says Coxe, "that she could at length indulge the sentiments of her gratitude towards the duke and affection towards the duchess. On the 17th of February, 1704, she informed the house, in conformity to their application, she purposed to convey to the Duke of Marlborough and his heirs the interest of the crown in the manor and honor of Woodstock, with the hundred of Wootton, and requested supplies for clearing off the encumbrances of that domain. A bill was introduced, and passed both houses without opposition. The preamble contained a recapitulation of the unparalleled services performed by Marlborough, not only to his own sovereign and fellow subjects, but to all Europe." * * * "Not satisfied that the nation alone should testify its gratitude, the queen accompanied the grant with an order to the Board of Works to erect, at the royal expense, a splendid palace, which, in memory of the victory, was to be called the Castle of Blenheim."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 252.

² In a note to the Duchess, after speaking of the difficulties of party, he says, "As far as it is in my power, for the sake of my country and the queen, for whom, had I a thousand lives, I would venture them all."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 5.

³ Coxe says, "Marlborough was convinced that a House of Commons, a ministry, and a sovereign, who had already construed his former services into crimes, would pursue him with additional acrimony, and be contented with nothing less than his ruin. He, therefore, could no longer hesitate on securing that asylum abroad, which was denied to him in his native land."—*Memoirs*, Vol. III, p. 323.

⁴ In a note to Godolphin, complaining of the dishonesty of officers, guilty of embezzlement, he says,—"God is most certainly with us, or it would have been impossible to overcome the many difficulties we have met with."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 836.

meaning. It was the loyalty of peace and of the constitution. He saw in war only the means of peace, the removal of obstacles to government, the terrible instrument of defence, but not an end to be perpetuated. He recognized civil authority as the rule of safety, and military necessity as the reign of danger. His readiness for battle indicated no love of war for gain or distinction, but a loyalty that was prepared for temporary sacrifice to secure a permanent peace. A general who cannot see the safety or danger of a policy for peace, or war; or is ignorant of the government which he represents, or that which he opposes, is an unsafe citizen, and therefore an unsafe officer. It is true, he may be engaged in a war upon which all parties are united, but in such case his patriotism is not tested.

It remains to be seen, what the Duke of Marlborough was as a partisan. In him we have an example, of what it is to be a soldier and not a statesman, a statesman and not a partisan. He studied the wants and capacities of armies, the designs and power of enemies, and yet allowed himself to be deceived by party prejudices, of which he was not conscious, and by party management which he was slow to understand.

He inherited toryism.¹ His veneration for kindred and early teachings disinclined him to party struggles. He imagined that he understood party distinctions, but he was indisposed to recognize either their influence, or value.² He seemed to think that it was quite possible to lead, as commander of the armies, and yet take no part in the conflicts of political parties, upon which armies depend both for their character and direction. He thought of parties, as he thought of despotisms, as arbitrary and unjust. "The French," said he, "when they are masters, make no distinctions."³ In a letter to his wife,⁴ speaking of parties in England, he says,—“I think the two parties so angry, that to ruin each other they will make no scruple of venturing the whole.” And again, “I see by this last letter, (Sept. 30, 1703) that you have mistaken my meaning in some of my letters; for though I may have complained of some you call your friends, yet it never entered into my thoughts that they should be spoken to in order to have a better thought of me; for I know they would be as unreasonable as the others in their expectations, if I should seek their friendship: *for all parties are alike*. And as I have taken my resolution of never doing any hardship to any man whatsoever, I shall by it have a quiet in my own mind; not valuing or desiring to be a favorite to either of them. For, in the humor I am now in, and that I hope in God I shall ever be of, I think both parties unreasonable and unjust.”⁵ In reply to the Duchess, who had communi-

¹ Coxe's Memoirs, Vol. I, p. iv.

² Ibid, Vol. I, p. 235.

³ Ibid, p. 134.

Ibid.

⁵ Coxe's Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 135.

cated her husband's wish to resign, to avoid the entanglements of party, the Queen said,—“The thoughts that both my dear Mrs. Freeman,¹ and Mr. Freeman, seem to have of retiring give me no small uneasiness.” *

* * “As for your poor unfortunate faithful Morley, she could not bear it; for if ever you should forsake me, I would have nothing more to do with the world, but make another abdication; for what is a crown when the support of it is gone? I will never forsake your dear self, Mr. Freeman, nor Mr. Montgomery, but always be your constant and faithful friend; and we four must never part till death mows us down with his impartial hand.”²

The Duke's loyalty to his sovereign nearly resembled devotion without judgment, and it was unpleasant for him to discriminate between the tory prejudices of the Queen, and her constitutional prerogatives. While the queen was perplexed in her weak endeavors to discriminate between the requisitions of party, and the constitutional duties of government, the Duke was reluctant to use his superior judgment in council to settle questions which had given origin and rise to parties. He practically adopted the absurdity that the government of a nation could be administered without the aid of parties, as if men were not made to differ as to means and methods of action. The party experience of Marlborough, was peculiar and instructive. At one time he claimed to be “of no party,” to be in the hands of the ministers as “white paper,” upon which they might write whatever they pleased, thus constituting himself merely a passive agent.³ This position was a culpable error,—inasmuch as it degraded him below the dignity of citizenship, and the responsible standard of humanity. He soon found that such a position was impracticable. He then committed the error, common to men who claim exemption from all party distinctions, that a commander of an army is morally competent to lead to battle while ignorant of its civil intent. “I shall serve the queen with all my soul,” said he, “even to the hazard of a thousand lives if I had them. But while I live I will meddle with no business but what belongs to the army.” But what an army is considered to be, detached from its governmental source he does not undertake to say. How he could serve the queen with all his soul, and “meddle with no business but what belongs to the army,” he does not attempt to explain. But, perhaps, we can reach his meaning by reading what he adds: “And this I shall beg of the queen, on my knees, if there be any occasion for it; and from henceforward shall never more use the

¹ To set aside the restraints of rank and custom, the princess offered her friend the choice of two feigned names, under which she proposed to continue their intercourse: Vol. I, p. 16.

“I,” says the duchess, “chose the name of *Freeman*, as more conformable to the

frankness of my disposition, and the princess adopted that of *Morley*.” *Montgomery* was given to Godolphin.—*Coxe's Memoirs*,

² *Ibid*, p. 182.

³ *Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. III, pp. 85, 111.

expression of being of no party, but shall certainly not care what any party thinks of me, being resolved to recommend myself to the people of England, by being to the best of my understanding, in the true interest of my country." This would either make him a servile follower of the queen, supposed to be without party adherents, or a self-made leader subject to no party, and yet subject to the will of the people representing all parties. The will of the people, it must be remembered, cannot be made known, until a policy is defined and declared, and they have acted upon it. An appeal to them in advance of such action, is ordinarily the appeal of a demagogue who looks for support in exchange for a compliment. Whatever was his real meaning, he soon found, that any escape from party was impossible. If he followed the queen, he could not be ignorant of her utter inability to lead, and whether he looked to the House of Lords, or to the House of Commons, to both, or to neither, and relied upon the Court for counsel, he could not but see the necessity of a discriminating judgment, the acceptance or rejection of party issues and conclusions. If he pursued a course acceptable to the Whigs, the Tories complained, and he was perplexed with importunities which implied a party confidence that he was not prepared to acknowledge. His unwillingness to identify himself with either party, rendered him justly liable to attacks from both parties.¹ His predisposed confidence in the Tory party gave him an unsatisfactory experience which he had no desire to see continued. At first he imagined that he could reject the counsel of extreme men of both parties, and thus, to use his own language, "by the help of God I shall endeavor to govern myself by what I think is right, and not because it may be desired by a party."² But when he found that all parties had their extreme exponents, and if deprived of them, they would be without leaders, he came to the conclusion that he had no alternative but to choose between the two, and to give his confidence to that, which, upon the whole was founded on principle, and could be trusted through the trials of change.

Moderation proved to be no remedy, and coalitions only aggravated existing evils, and often created new ones. The no-party man is always at the mercy of politicians and party writers. He is often urged forward, or

¹ Even at the army he was not beyond the sphere of contention. Godolphin, his constant correspondent, incessantly expatiated on the divisions in the cabinet and the clamors of party, and overwhelmed his friend with complaints on his own irksome situation and his unpleasant intercourse with the queen, who assailed him with reproaches whenever he presumed to con-

vey the slightest hint on the necessity of conciliating the Whigs. Wearied with censure and contradiction, he at length repeatedly declared his resolution of retiring from a situation in which he could not obtain the support, or even indulgence of either party. — *Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 181.

² *Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 245.

backward ; to leave a party, or to join a party ; to make a new issue, or to ignore an old one,—according to the degree of hesitation, or inclination with which he timidly expresses his opinions, and which he fails to disguise. He is constantly watched, his motives misrepresented, or exaggerated, and continued determination to evade party committals often involves him in greater difficulties than fall to the lot of extreme partisans. Marlborough was opposed by ambitious men,¹ who despaired of his aid, and misrepresented by the spies of France who regarded him as the most powerful enemy to their master.²

But, in the life of Marlborough, there is another element to be noted, without a knowledge of which, it would be difficult to understand either his conduct or character. During his whole mature life he was an ardent lover of his wife. She was a Whig, and a devoted servant to the queen, who was a Tory. His wife and Anne were early dear friends. When tested by the heartless influences of official station, and by the realities of life, the most hallowed friendship was turned to bitter hate. The existing inequalities between Marlborough and the queen not only increased the difficulties of a practical application of the government, but these difficulties were complicated by the superior influence of “Queen Sarah,”³ the Duchess of Marlborough. She was a lady of remarkable capacity, combining talent with genius, and foresight with judgment. Her acquired knowledge, and quick understanding ; her keen sense of right, her fearless scorn of wrong,—gave her a promptness of manner, which at times seemed bold for a woman of refinement. Her relations of duty, with greatness in the character of her illustrious husband on the one hand, and with littleness on the other, in the person of her most intimate friend, the queen, frequently impelled her to utter language apparently impatient, and to do things, apparently ill-natured. The unavoidable transitions of the mind of a pure and honest woman of quick perceptions ; from greatness to littleness, and from littleness to greatness,—whose conceptions of duty embraced alike the affairs of the nation, the pride of personal distinction, the love and happiness of her domestic circle,—could not be otherwise than extreme and significant. It was, indeed, a wide range for the exercise of a mind naturally gifted and active, and correspondingly invested with the passions and affections of the noble soul of a true woman.

And here, perhaps, as appropriately as in any other connection, it may be profitable briefly to consider the mission and characteristics of woman. Such a digression will enable the student to read history with a clearer view of the motives, duties, and acts of men and women, as they are developed

¹ Coxe's Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 84.

² Ibid, p. 37.

³ This title was given the Duchess in derision.

in society, or in government, and to draw an intelligent line of distinction between the peculiarities of sex, and the common properties of mind. Besides, both men and women who have capacity and high motives to be useful, may be persuaded to see the economy of employing their time each in their own sphere. Such a course will secure to themselves and to society, more efficient labors, greater blessings, surer happiness. Co-partners engaged in commercial pursuits divide and subdivide their labors to insure efficiency and success. Such a division of duties between man and woman, and man and wife, would be still more important, inasmuch as the fundamental lines are indicated by nature.

THE MISSION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MAN AND WOMAN.

A comparison of the sexes, with a view to disparagement or exaltation of the one, or the other, is not only of questionable taste, but of doubtful philosophy.¹ Man was created for one sphere of duty, woman for another. Man was peculiarly fitted for one class of duties, woman for another. They cannot exchange places if they would, nor can they exchange duties which have been respectively assigned them by Divine appointment. We speak of fundamental duties, and here will be found the standard of principle, which will lead to a correct classification of other duties of a minor nature, emanating from these. Each sex has a central point of duty and influence, fixed by nature, and independent of circumstances. To a certain extent, circumstances may be modified by choice, or by necessity, but all deviations from the standard rule will be found to be in violation either of good taste, or of the natural laws. What can be done best by man, should be regarded as man's duty. What can be best done by woman, should be left for woman to do. This view does not preclude that participation of duties, equally open to both sexes, and which do not depend for their success on the peculiarities of either sex. These, in no respect, constitute an element in the basis of society, and therefore may be executed by the skill of mind, whether in man or woman.

But, because each sex has its separate sphere of duty, it must not be inferred that one sex can be independent of the other. Each has its peculiar responsibilities, and each receives and extends an influence to the other. Both have each a special mission, both have a common good, and this is great or small, much or little, as each is faithful to itself. Man can best contribute to the happiness of woman by noble and manly conduct, and woman can best refine and elevate man and society, by womanly acts and womanly virtues. Though each sex has its particular kinds and sources of knowledge, nec-

¹ Schlegel's *Philosophy of Life*, p. 47.

essary for its own good and advancement, yet, to a certain degree, a common knowledge of the duties of both sexes is requisite to secure a harmony of motives and unity of action.¹

Man is endowed with physical strength and power of endurance. He is endowed with intellect, instincts and passions fitted to explore the external world, and to brave the dangers which constantly threaten the public good, the peace of society, and the stability of domestic happiness. His duties are outward, physical, subduing and cultivating. He meets his fellow in his full strength and maturity, and measures with him the skill of mental capacity, and the dexterity of limb and muscle. He explores and studies the earth, sea and air, that he may command their productions, and avoid their dangers. He captures and tames the wild and ferocious animals of the forest, and places safeguards against their depredations upon defenceless society. He conquers the monster, wherever found, and trains the sagacious beast wherever wanted. He meets and masters the foe of personal safety, the robber of gold and chastity, the oppressor of weakness, the slanderer of virtue and of innocence. He is the natural protector of the wife, the mother and the children of his generation, and of the homes where they dwell, and where centres all his happiness, whether personal, private or public. He combines with his fellows and with society, to build up and to fortify the nation, without which, his home would not be worth preserving, and life would be valueless. He studies the arts and sciences with motives to practical results, and engages in an industry that is remunerative. The trades and professions are marked out and provided for, with a prudence to insure success, and to discourage pretence and empiricism. Navigation and commerce are defined and regulated in a manner to reward enterprise and encourage competition. It is his business to organize the government of the town, state and nation, and to enter into the necessary conflicts of opinion to establish them, and to administer them according to the recognized standards of principle. To secure equal rights, and to protect property, he organizes political parties, and enters into the bitter strife of public agitation, having often to meet the desperate shifts of ambition, and the disgusting schemes of selfishness and corruption. It is within his province to protect society against crime in its terrible variety, and to guard the nation against the horrors of war. He makes the police and the army, and fights the battles enjoined upon the able bodied citizens demanded by the laws of his country. All these things he does for the world, for society, for himself, for his children, for woman,—and in obedience to the

¹ In *Paradise lost*, Milton says,

“To know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge, and her praise.”

He doubtless refers to knowledge proper to woman in contradistinction to that which is proper to man.

sentiments and propensities of his nature, and to the declared will of God. His physical organization and mental constitution are adapted by his Creator to the performance of these rough, difficult and outward duties, and this adaptation is acknowledged by the people of all civilized nations.

Woman is that embodiment of soul, romance,¹ beauty and delicacy,—that gives refinement to society, delight and enjoyment to the senses, and happiness to the mind. The earliest consciousness of the infant when pressed to its mother's bosom is spent upon its mother's delicate touch and beauty. Her soft lips, her speaking eyes, her gentle words, her playful patience, her sunny smiles—are permitted to make the first impressions upon its tender mind. These beautiful beginnings of life make its first store of knowledge. They enrapture maturing youth and manhood, and are exalted by the poet, and dignified by the philosopher and the divine. *MOTHER*, becomes the most hallowed word of all languages. In the mother are to be found the deep and unalterable affections of the soul. "Her smiles," says a gifted writer, "call into exercise the first affections that spring up in our hearts. She cherishes and expands the earliest germs of our intellects. She lifts our little hands, and teaches our tongues to lisp in prayer. She watches over us like a guardian angel, and protects us through all our helpless years, when we know not of her cares, and her anxieties on our account. She follows us into the world of men, and lives in us, and blesses us, when she lives not otherwise upon the earth."² "In all our trials," says Washington Irving, "amid all our afflictions, she is still by our side: if we sin, she reproves more in sorrow than in anger; nor can she tear us from her bosom, nor forget that we are her child." As she is the centre of "that sweet fountain of all true life upon earth, the happy home," her nature should be permitted to command all the joyous elements of its atmosphere and surroundings. Without her it cannot be found, to create it is her mission. The characteristics of the true woman may be seen and felt, but language is inadequate to their description.

Who, but the poets of all time, can delineate the beautiful outlines and exquisite features of the portrait of woman! As the artist tints the canvas to represent the human countenance in its genial and happy moments, so

¹ Dr. Croly says, "In the whole course of my life I never met a female, from the flat-nosed and ebony-colored inhabitant of the tropics to the snow-white and sublime divinity of a Greek Isle, without a touch of romance; repulsiveness could not conceal it, age could not extinguish it, vicissitude could not change it. I have found it in all times and places; like a spring of fresh waters starting up even from the flint;

cheering the cheerless, softening the insensible, renovating the withered; a secret whisper in every woman alive, that, to the last, passion might flutter its rosy pinions round her brow."—"What Men have said about Woman," by Henry Southgate, p. 153. A beautiful volume, and highly creditable to its author.

² Thomas Carter.

let the poets speak of woman as she is seen in her sphere of duty : Of her enduring and graceful actions ;¹ her active sympathies² and irrepressible joys ; her quick discernment³ and captivating acquiescence ; her sweet and varied attractions ;⁴ her beauteous bearing in poverty,⁵ her meekness in wealth ; her unpretending benevolence,⁶ her lenient and healing charity ; her winning modesty and unapproachable chastity ;⁷ her pure friendship and sisterly affection ;⁸ her innocent impatience,⁹ and virtuous passion ;¹⁰ her educational instincts,¹¹ and circumspection ; her heroism in adversity,¹² and nice perceptions of duty ;¹³ her refined taste and eloquent blushes ;¹⁴ her lofty pride and approving admiration of chivalry ;¹⁵ her peaceful dignity,¹⁶ and dauntless courage ;¹⁷ her speaking sentiments and silent eloquence ;¹⁸ her beaming eyes, her lovely face and form ;¹⁹ her elegance and economy ;²⁰ her airy footsteps,²¹ and quick discovery of suffering need ;²² her inspiring and purifying influence and innate judgement ;²³ her joyous laugh,²⁴ and bashful frown ;²⁵ her lively fancy and feeling heart ; her fairy musings and sensibility ;²⁶ her helplessness,²⁷ and hopeful expectancy ;²⁸ her enchanting glances, and gently entreating voice ;²⁹ her rebuking wit, and submissive wisdom ;³⁰ her innocent gayety and buoyant spirit ;³¹ her pensiveness and her sorrows ;³² her patient suffering, and quiet resignation ; her persuasive tears and cheerful content ;³³ the raptures of maternity,³⁴ and her loveliness augmented by virtue and maturity ;³⁵ her prayerful spirit and pious devotion ;³⁶ her ever enduring love ;³⁷ her trust in God,—these, these are some of the supreme qualities which mark and beautify the empire of perfect womanhood. Without them society would fall back to barbarism, and civilization would be impossible. No being but God can make them more, no creature but man would make them less.

¹ Milton.² Bennoch, Bellew.³ Byron.⁴ Shakespeare.⁵ Cowper.⁶ Dryden.⁷ Addison.⁸ Robert de Brunne.⁹ Shakespeare.¹⁰ Schiller.¹¹ Landor.¹² Washington Irving.¹³ Novalis.¹⁴ Dr. Donne.¹⁵ Burke.¹⁶ Byron.¹⁷ Tennyson.¹⁸ Ibid, Shakespeare.¹⁹ Ibid, Pinkney.²⁰ Dryden.²¹ Scott.²² Balfour.²³ Boardman.²⁴ Massey.²⁵ Southey.²⁶ Bulwer.²⁷ Bethmont, Farquhar.²⁸ Southgate.²⁹ Homer, Shakespeare, Mabeinger.³⁰ Shakespeare, Thomson.³¹ Otway.³² Richter, Byron.³³ Saville.³⁴ Byron.³⁵ Addison.³⁶ Keats.³⁷ Sandford Barle, Byron, Irving.

Some most intelligent and worthy people, of both sexes, however, would invade this holy sphere of woman, consecrated by Divine love, and hallowed by the associations of domestic bliss. They speak of rights, as if love were created by act of Congress; they speak of freedom, when freedom is only found where happiness dwells; they speak of property, as if man's selfishness were not sufficient for humanity, and that its degrading cares should be shared by woman; they speak of female suffrage, as if it were a greater boon to act with wicked men than to influence them; they speak of equality, as if the rights of men were superior to the privileges ordained by God. They seem to forget that there is an eternal fitness of things which cannot be changed, without new laws of being, new laws of order.¹ Such changes bear no fruit but loss and disappointment. In no sense should the advancement and elevation of woman be limited; but in aspiring to be more she should not consent to be less. To blend the beautiful with the common is natural. Good and evil, strength and weakness, go hand in hand together. The graceful and flowering shrub springs up beside the sturdy oak; the fragrant flower blooms next the repulsive weed; and the diamond sparkles in its dirty bed. He that would reduce them to a common level, and destroy that variety which comes from the source of all goodness and beauty, could he have his way, would soon obliterate the harmony which only can be found in distinct and separate creations, and supplant the means of life and happiness, by the desolations of unmeaning sameness, and functionless existences.

Female suffrage has been discussed as connected with the principle of representation and taxation. Let this view be examined for a moment. All political rights are based, or should be, on the acknowledged principles of justice. The rights of man and woman in their joint relations, however, have another element in their foundation not to be disregarded—the divine law. Male and female are born in equal numbers—thus beautifully indicating the divine law of companionship of the sexes. The right of representation, connecting interests with principles, is exhausted by the sacred institution of marriage. Two are made one. A unit marks the centre of a perfect circle. This right of representation cannot be duplicated without danger to social harmony, or domestic happiness. It is to be remembered, too, that the principle of representation as connected with taxation has reference only to communities, not individuals. Besides, female holders of property, probably, do not number more than one in a thousand, and most of this small minority employ male agents to do their business. To suppose any hardship in such a condition is to dwell upon nominal dis-

¹ To be man's tendermate was woman born,
And in obeying nature she best serves
The purposes of Heaven."—*Schiller*.

Solomon says, "A good woman looketh well to the ways of her household, and all her family is clothed in scarlet."

inctions,—a habit which is morally unprofitable. It is frequently said that some women are more capable of managing property than some men. This is conceded—but it proves nothing. Some men are known to be better qualified to take care of children—than their mothers—but it does not follow therefore, that it is advisable that such men should take their places. To elucidate still further, let the subject of property be considered.

Property is impersonal. The vote that protects the money of the wealthiest man, equally protects the widow's mite. To invite the widow to vote would be equivalent to conferring upon her a barren privilege, an exhausted right. It would be like giving her permission to *command the stone to fall*, when she should drop it, or the *water to run*—when she should pour it. It is an apt and significant remark of Froude to illustrate a nominal agency:—"You do not preach to the acorn that it is its duty to become a large tree." Nor is it wisdom to spend much time in endeavors to estimate the value of the privilege of recognizing and enjoying the identity of the widow's farthing that is merged in the wealth of society, where millions of all classes alike are equally interested and protected by the practical judgment and conventional wisdom of ages.¹

It cannot be disputed that there are many women of masculine endowments, whose tastes naturally lead them to sympathize more with men, in their studies and pursuits, than with persons of their own sex. History affords many such examples, and it would be unjust to deny that such have made creditable contributions not only to literature, but to the arts and sciences.² On the other hand, there are many men to be found of femi-

¹ The advocates of female suffrage in England had a fourth defeat in the House of Commons in 1878. The vote, in a House of 877 members, stood 810 to 67—against the measure. Female suffrage in England exists in a modified form:—"Women vote in the municipal, parochial and school elections; they aid to elect mayors, vestrymen and school committees composed of both sexes."—*Boston Post*, June 2, 1878. The women of *Wyoming Territory*, U. S., both vote and hold office. The recent moral and devotional movements of women under the lead of Dr. Dio Lewis, in the Temperance cause, show the influence of woman as woman. If these women were voters they would have no more influence in such a movement than the men.

² A Spanish book, entitled "*El Teatro Crítico*," speaks of the following literary women in Spain:—*Ann de Cervaton*, Lady

of the bed-chamber to Queen Ferdinand, the Catholic's second consort. *Isabella de Joya*, sixteenth century, preached in the cathedral of Barcelona. She solved many points, in the books of the subtil Scotus, before the College of Cardinals. *Louisa Sigea* is represented as mistress of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac. *Oliva Sabuco de Nantes* is said to have written excellently on physical, medical, moral and political subjects. *Bernada Ferreyra* is described as well versed in rhetoric, philosophy and mathematics. *Juana Morella* is said to have possessed a profound knowledge of philosophy, divinity and jurisprudence, besides speaking fourteen different languages. French and Italian ladies are said to have distinguished themselves, in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries:—*Susan de Habert*, *Mary de Gourney*, *Magdalene Schuderi*,

nine characteristics. Such examples, however, must be regarded as exceptions tending only to establish the line of distinction between the sexes. It may be remarked, too, that those women who speak of rights and of legislation with a design to reform the natural organization of society, generally possess, though not always, certain features of character repulsive to both sexes. The superior woman, intellectually seeks the superior man, but it cannot be denied that such partiality is not often reciprocated, unless both are stoics, in which case they meet more as man and man, than as man and woman. There are many of both sexes who are passionless from their birth. Marriage can add but little to their happiness. The superior man, generally, admires woman in her mental perfection as woman, but not as man. The attractions of feminine beauty cannot be imitated by men, and woman degrades her higher nature when she attempts to appear like man. The most unlike of the two sexes, would be the most superior man, and the most superior woman. The less, therefore, each sex endeavors to imitate the other, the greater is the distinctive perfection of true character

Ann la Fevre, Madame Dacier. In Italy, a Doctor's degree was conferred on *Dorothea Bucca*. *Laura Cereti* taught philosophy in Brescia, at the age of eighteen. *Isotta Nogarola, Cassandra Fideli, Catherine de Cibo*, Duchess of Camerino, *Lucretia Helena Cornaro*—may be added to the list. *Anna Maria Schurman*, and others of Germany might be added.

In the Campo-Sante, Bologna, it is recorded on the tomb of a lady, who was professor of Greek in the University of Bologna, from 1794 to 1817. There was a still more remarkable case in this University in the 14th century:—*Miss Novella d'Andross* occupied one of the chairs with great success it is said, but not without apparent danger. Having great personal beauty, she was obliged to lecture behind a curtain, which concealed her person while it did not prevent her from being heard.

At the fifth annual session of the Medical College for Women, in London, Dr. Geo. Ross, in the inaugural lecture, says, "History abounds in narratives of women who have distinguished themselves in every vocation in life." He speaks of *Hypatia*, of Alexandria; of *Clotilda Tambroni*, professor of Greek at Bologna; of Elizabeth Carter, Caroline Herschel, and Mrs. Som-

erville of England. The list of distinguished ladies in England made complete would be an extended one. Some may be mentioned:—*Joanna Baillie, Anna Letitia Barbauld, Maria Edgeworth, Hannah More, Elizabeth Hamilton, Mary Russell Mitford, Mary Wortley Montagu, Countess of Blessington, Harriet Martineau, Felicia D. Hemans, Barbara Hofland, Elizabeth Inchbald, Miss Landon, Amelia Opie, Anna Maria Porter, Anne Radcliffe, Eliza Cook, Caroline Norton, Mary Howitt, Mrs. Browning.* In France, *Madame de Staël, Madame Dudevant, Mary de Sévigné, Susanna Centlivre, Madame D'Arblay, Sophia Cottin, Madame Junot.* In Sweden, *Frederika Bremer.*

Among the gifted daughters of America, we may mention,—*Hannah Adams, Miss Sedgwick, L. H. Sigourney, Sarah J. Hale, Lydia Maria Child, Hannah F. Gould, Mrs. Follen, Mrs. Nathan Hale, Margaret Fuller, Julia Ward Howe, Catherine Beecher, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Alice and Phoebe Cary, Mrs. Ellet, Mrs. Embury, Mrs. Parton, Caroline Gilman, Frances S. Osgood, Mrs. Z. Fay Pierce, Mrs. Lowell, Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Alcott, Mrs. Horace Mann, Elizabeth Peabody, Anna Dickinson, Mrs. Lippincott.*

in both. A true woman, distinguished for her womanly beauty, and womanly character, would influence a philosopher or statesman a thousand times more than one without such charms, who had mastered the works of Newton, or La Placc, or who had successfully labored in the fields of literature.¹ Let science and literature be added to these charms, and no stoic, however hardened by study, or exalted by philosophy—could be indifferent to her influence. Each sex must perfect its own peculiar character, before it can hope to attain to the highest degree of influence with the other. Man, by perversion, cannot improve upon what God has established. The supremacy of woman inheres in the laws of human existence, and such laws can neither be altered nor repealed.

It has been truly said, that beauty is nature's greatest force, and when Keats was inspired to write the line,—

“A thing of beauty is a joy forever,”

he gave ample evidence of his ability to comprehend the sentiment in its application. The beauty of things, and the beauty of person, however, are widely different subjects. The physical beauty of man and woman,—makes a part of their nature as connected with their instincts. It has a place in the economy of the human soul,—in the laws of progressive existence. It inspires the union of the sexes with foretastes of happiness, without which humanity would be a blank, and life a dream.

But it is not enough that the person of woman should be beautiful. She is endowed with exquisite tastes to be developed and gratified. These should be educated to the high standard of principle. Her inventive genius is associated with her pride, and vanity is crystallized into system, and finds its lawful appointments. In regard to things of beauty, the sexes act in harmony according to their tastes and means. Man labors for the woman he loves. In pleasing her he doubles his own happiness. As lover he becomes her servant. “To give pain is the tyranny, to make happy is the true empire of beauty,” is the language of Steele. Of this empire, woman is the supreme head. Science and Art are made her servants. They explore the earth and ocean for the choicest gems, the rarest tissues

¹ GOETHE says,—“We love a girl for very different things than understanding. We love her for her beauty, her youth, her mirth, her confidingness, her character, with its faults, caprices, and God knows what other inexpressible charms; but we do not love her understanding. Her mind we esteem (if it is brilliant), and it may greatly elevate her in our opinion; nay more, it may enchain us when we already love. But her understanding is not *that* which awakens and inflames our passions.” “The beauty of a woman cheereth the countenance, and a man loveth nothing better,” is the language to be found in Ecclesiasticus, xxxvi: 22.

and the finest fabrics. The spinner and weaver, the milliner and mantua-maker, the embroiderer and hair dresser of every clime are in perpetual requisition to construct new fabrics, to devise new displays of color, new adornments for the human form. Chemists exert their skill to discover the cosmetic powers of nature, and to combine her varied fragrance into new perfumes. The muse and the votaries of art contribute their influence, and invest the altar of beauty with their wonderful enchantments. The metals are shaped and polished in every variety of form by the skilful smith, and studded with pearls, diamonds, "inestimable sapphires," rubies, and precious stones of every variety of tint and brilliancy. No living animal, bird or insect—but is made to embellish the illimitable *trousseau* of woman.

The pleasures of fashion are the delights of admiration. It is the rule of the senses. To meet their imperative demands the world is put into active competition in the production of novelties.¹ This rivalry of sentiment in the reign of beauty is woman's sole dominion. It is the absolutism of Beauty. Man has no place in it except as subject. As a being delighting in finery, he is seldom entitled to a place in history. The recognized leaders of fashion are its despots. They are the only tyrants in the world that cannot be dethroned except by tyrants greater than themselves. Even royalty submitted to this despotism of beauty—when Queen Elizabeth issued her mandate to the dressmakers, to devise a different dress for every day in the year. It is a despotism that may be refined and improved—but never destroyed.

The history of woman in all ages—indicates the condition and cultivation of man and the refinements of society. Her mission as wife, mother, sister and friend—comprehends the highest culture, the noblest motives, the purest happiness, the wisest ends. Before her creation, the poet declares that,—

‘The world was sad! the garden was a wild!
And man, the hermit sigh’d, till woman smiled!’

When seen and understood in her true position, her influence in every

¹ A lady engaged in the business of renting dresses in one of our large cities, said to a reporter:—"I am the inventor of this business. If you know anything about women, you know that the most of them have not only a passion for dress, but a weakness for novelty. The woman that has one calico dress wants two, and the woman with ten silks wants eleven. The rule is good with the owners of the most

complete wardrobe. Women don't like to wear the same dress to more than one or two parties in one season. Now it is upon these female characteristics that I thrive. To protect ladies against being caught wearing a *hired dress*—I alter the appearance of a dress every time it is worn. I am patronized mostly by the higher class of ladies."

clime is to ennoble humanity. Whenever and wherever woman is abused, man is debased. When neglected, society loses its charms, and life its ends.

A woman may become a servant, a laborer, a mechanic, an artist, a clerk, a trader, a farmer, a shepherdess, a sextoness, a doctress, a lawyer, a magistrate, a preacher, a professor, an editress, an authoress, a postmistress, a courtier, a soldier, or a spy,—for she has been all these. These vocations do not specially prepare her to become a wife, or a mother, or to fit her to take her true position in society. They simply enable her to cultivate a special genius, or to secure a living, but they are not expected to develop her best energies, or to form her highest character. In all countries where different kinds of labor are indiscriminately followed by both sexes alike,—labor itself becomes degraded, and woman loses her high position as woman.

In all ages, women have acted important parts in governments, in revolutions, in peace and in war. For good or evil they have influenced kings and queens, statesmen and generals. They have aided and encouraged patriotism, endured the hardships of war, cheered the brave, nursed the wounded, and soothed the dying.¹ They have participated in plots of treason, organized mobs and committed violence, instigated crime and corruption in government, and by their beauty and allurements have misled and ruined the weak, and the strong, and as Solomon says, have “increased the transgressors among men.”²

It is not necessary to discuss in this place, the philosophy of the Salic law, although it cannot be regarded otherwise than an interesting subject

¹ In a letter addressed to the Earl of Dartmouth by a clergyman of Maryland, dated Dec. 20, 1775, is the following paragraph:—“Let a person go into any province, city, town, or county, and ask the females, ‘Are you willing your sons or brothers should go for soldiers, and defend their liberties?’ they would severally answer,—‘Yes, with all my soul; and if they won’t go, I won’t own them as my sons or brothers; for I’ll help myself if there should be any need of mine. If I can’t stand in the ranks, I can help forward powder, balls, and provisions.’”—*Am. Archives, 4th series, Vol. iv, p. 363.*

² The record of woman as queen, or magistrate—will be found in works of history. Also, her record as connected with Kings, Emperors, and public ministers.

“There has been no great epoch of human conflict,” says Dr. Goss, “that has not given birth to extraordinary women—to its Anne Askew, its Joan of Arc, its Agostinia, its Charlotte Corday, its Madame Roland, its Florence Nightingale.” He speaks of Bodocia, Semiramis, Deborah, the mother of Israel. The influence of woman on public men is a most important subject to be studied and understood. Examples are to be found everywhere and at all times, and if collected would make a large volume. For example,—Talleyrand and Dorothea, Wm. Penn and the maids of honor, in the time of James II., (see Macaulay,) Franklin and Lord Howe’s sister, Maj. André and Mrs. Arnold, Cavour and Ristoria, etc. In the history of the Drama, of Genius, of the Fine Arts,

if viewed in connection with a monarchical government.¹ Where the crown is hereditary, and the head that wears it is designated without reference to its experience, character or intelligence,—it becomes a useful inquiry to make, whether the occasional presence of a pure and virtuous queen would not exclude from the throne and court the impurities of bad men and women, and secure the influence of the pure and good of both sexes. The reader will be at no loss to imagine the evils of a queen of an opposite character.²

But let us inquire, what it is—that gives to woman her great power over man, for good or evil? Is it her charms as woman, or is it her goodness or intelligence,—without reference to sex?

“The influence which the bigotry of one female,” says Alexander Hamilton, “the petulances of another, the cabals of a third, had in the contemporary policy, ferments, and pacifications, of a considerable part of Europe, are topics that have been too often descanted upon not to be generally known.” This was said in the sixth number of the “Federalist,” and he refers to Madame de Maintenon, Madame de Pompadour, and to the Duchess of Marlborough. By means of a love affair, Fabius Maximus was enabled to recover Tarentum, which had been treacherously delivered up to Hannibal.³ Pericles, in compliance with the resentments of a prostitute, Aspasia, at the expense of much of the blood and treasure of his countrymen, attacked, vanquished, and destroyed the city of the Samnians.⁴ Thargelia, by her beauty, it is said, obtained the sovereignty of Thessaly. Plutarch

and of Philanthropy—many women have made for themselves illustrious records.

¹ By the Salic law females are excluded from inheriting the crown of France. It was instituted by Pharamond, A. D. 424. It was ratified in a council of state by Clovis I., the real founder of the French monarchy, in 511.—*Hénault's France*. See Hallam's “*State of Europe, During the Middle Ages*,” Vol. I, p. 32.

² In speaking of certain questionable allegations of Isabella, queen of Edward III., who was said to be “one of the fairest ladies of the world,”—Sir James Mackintosh says,—“There is nothing, however, in the known morality of princesses in any age which can exempt an alienated and enraged queen from the suspicion of seeking consolation in amours.”—*Hist. of England*, p. 123.

³ Plutarch's *Lives*, Vol. I, p. 312.

⁴ Plutarch thinks it proper “to inquire by what art or power Aspasia captivated the greatest statesmen, and brought even philosophers to speak of her so much to her advantage. Some indeed say, that Pericles made his court to her only on account of her wisdom and political abilities. Nay, even Socrates himself sometimes visited her along with his friends; and her acquaintances took their wives with them to hear her discourse, though the business that supported her was neither honorable nor decent, for she kept a number of courtezans in her house.”—*Plutarch's Lives*, Vol. I, p. 276. Cratinus plainly calls her a prostitute:—

—“She bore this *Juno*, this *Aspasia*.
Skilled in the shameless trade and every art
Of wantonness.

—*Ibid*, p. 278.

says of her,—“She is reported to have descended from the ancient Ionians, and to have reserved her intimacies for the great.” She was murdered by one of her lovers.¹ When Elpinice addressed Pericles as a suppliant, in favor of her brother Cimon, he evidently intended to remind her of a former power which she had lost by age. He said, smiling, “You are old, Elpinice; much too old to solicit in so weighty an affair.” Still, she saved her brother’s life.²

“It is somewhat extraordinary,” says Tytler, “that most of the revolutions of the Roman state should have owed their origin to women. To a woman, Rome owed the abolition of the regal dignity and the establishment of the republic. To a woman, she owed her delivery from the tyranny of the decemviri, and the restoration of the consular government; and to a woman, she owed that change of the constitution by which the Plebeians became capable of holding the highest offices of the commonwealth.”³ The judgment of Dr. Tytler is entitled to much consideration, and yet, in this passage he commits the common error of attributing great consequences to trivial causes. This subject, however, is discussed in another place.⁴

The influence of woman is still greater, when it is combined with parental affection. Themistocles, speaking of his son as being master of his mother, and by her means of himself, said laughing,—“This child is greater than any man in Greece; for the Athenians command the Greeks, I command the Athenians, his mother commands me, and he commands his mother.”⁵

But, perhaps, the most interesting example to illustrate the power of woman when moved by patriotism and affection, by the highest and purest motives of the soul,—is to be found in the history of Caius Marcius Coriolanus, an illustrious patrician of Rome, who had nobly defended his country in many glorious battles.⁶ He had been unjustly accused of treason, by political enemies, and with precipitous excitement the tribunes condemned him, without trial, to be thrown from the top of the Tarpeian Rock. This sentence was subsequently changed to that of perpetual banishment. Disgusted by perfidy, and stung to madness by an ungrateful people,—he forgot his own high standard of self-sacrifice, and studied only how he could be revenged upon his country. He surrendered himself to the enemies of his native land, the Volscians, and promised faithfully to serve them. The Volscians knew his character, they feared and honored him,—and placed him at the head of their army. Rome was endangered by his

¹ Plutarch’s Lives, Vol. I, p. 277.

² Ibid, Vol. I, p. 265.

³ Univ. Hist., Vol. I, p. 348.

⁴ See Chapters on War and Revolutions.

⁵ Plutarch’s Lives, Vol. I, p. 205.

⁶ We abridge from Plutarch’s Lives, Vol. I, p. 359.

advances,—and the government and people were in a state of consternation and despair,—until relieved by a movement of the mother, wife and matrons of the city. This is a lesson full of instruction, showing in a beautiful manner, what “women as women,” can do. Their power was greater than that of state, or arms: it mastered both. It was greater than that of *Revenge*—that desperate sense of wrong that forces into its service all the passions of hate,—acknowledging no right, no honor, no love, no pity, no mercy, no fear. An abridgement of Plutarch’s interesting account of this remarkable event has been placed in the Appendix,—so that the reader may not be without its teachings.¹

During the French Revolution, it was decreed by the Municipality of Paris, that *pretty* women should not be permitted to appear at the Mayor’s Office to make requests. This decree was opposed as absurd in a land of freedom. A member of the Common Council said,—“that in the land of freedom the public offices were necessarily open to all; that tastes differed, and that a lady might be rejected as ugly by one, and admitted by another as pretty; and that young and old, handsome or plain, all might have business to do; that, in short, the public offices could not execute the decree.” Herbert, the Attorney of the Council, however, renewed his complaints against these *Circes*, as he called them, to the great satisfaction of the crowd of women, most of them old, and all of them disgusting, who composed the auditory.

This principle of influence was well understood by Louis XIV., when he induced the Duchess of Orleans to visit her brother, Charles the Second, and to take with her the young and beautiful Queronnaille, knowing “that in order to fix him in the French interests, he had only to bind him by the ties of pleasure, the only ones which with him were irresistible.”² The latter was soon created Duchess of Portsmouth.

But for the quick suspicion of Duroc, and an observing cook, Napoleon would have been placed in an early grave by the hand of a woman. Two attempts were made on his life, one by Charlotte Encore, and one by Pauline Riotti. The former with avowed motives to public good, and the latter for revenge. The attempt of Charlotte led to an imperial decree forbidding the approach of women to the person of the Emperor without special permission. No man, probably, ever had more experience than Talleyrand, in employing women to aid the purposes of public ministers. It has been said that his female agents of *secret* diplomacy were frequently more useful than those of the other sex. His belief in the necessity of intrigues made him a good judge of character, of both sexes. His respect for success above principle exempted him from all suspicion of conscientious

¹ See APPENDIX, E.

² Hume’s England, Vol. vi, p. 86.

doubts. The fact that the diplomatic agency of women is of a secret nature clearly discovers its true character. Public men are slow to confess their follies connected with their duties, or their weaknesses as the sources of their merit.

How can it be explained that the famous Madame Chevalier¹ should exert an influence sufficient to command greater fees than any government pays to its foreign ambassadors? She could boast of no sacrifice to public good, of no husband entitled to respect, of no children to excite sympathy, of no connections to insure confidence, no act of virtue or valor to inspire the heart of chivalry, nor of physical beauty to fascinate the weak, or to attract the manly eye of admiration. In person she was short, fat and coarse. Her mouth was large, her eyes hollow, and her nose short. Her language was obscene, and her manners familiar and vulgar. With her unprincipled husband, she took an active part in low political intrigues, and secured the friendship of jacobin cabals. In contemplating such qualities the reader fails to discover any power to fascinate either man or woman. And yet, with all these traits of character, combined with a bold and insinuating address of a reckless woman, reckless only of what she did not prize, and bent only on what she was bound to accomplish, whether good or evil,—but few were capable of withstanding her vile temptations, her wicked purposes. Thus, it is to be seen, that female influence, whether exerted for public good or public calamity,—is the influence of woman as woman, and not as woman in the official place of man.²

The reader will recollect with how much truth it is written in the Book of Esdras, in the argument before King Darius,—to prove the strength of woman:—"Yea, a man taketh his sword, and goeth his way to rob and to steal, and to sail upon the sea and upon rivers; and looketh upon a lion, and goeth in the darkness; and when he hath stolen, spoiled, and robbed, he bringeth it to his love. Wherefore a man loveth his wife better than father and mother. Yea, many there be that have run out their wits for women, and become servants for their sakes. Many also have perished, have erred and sinned, for women. And now do you not believe me? Is not the King great in his power? Do not all regions fear to touch him? Yet, did I see him and Apame, the King's concubine, the daughter of the

¹ She was the daughter of a workman at a silk manufactory at Lyons; she ceased to be a maid before she had attained the age of woman, and lived in a brothel in her native city, kept by a Madame Thibault, where her husband first became acquainted with her.—*Secret Hist. Court and Cabinet of St. Cloud*, p. 226.

² De Lolme says,—“As one instance how little man is known to himself, it might be mentioned that no tolerable explanation of that continual phenomenon laughter has yet been given; and the powerful complicate sensation which each sex produces in the other, still remains an equally inexplicable mystery.”—*Eng. Constitution*, p. xxiii.

admirable Bartacus, sitting at the right hand of the King, and taking the crown from the King's head, and setting it upon her own head; she also struck the King with her left hand. And yet for all this the King gaped and gazed upon her with open mouth: if she laughed upon him, he laughed also: but if she took any displeasure at him, the King was fain to flatter, that she might be reconciled to him.¹

It was clearly proved that woman was stronger than either the King, or Wine. To compare any earthly power with truth, is inadmissible. Truth is an attribute of Deity.

To what living man would Herod have made the unconditional promise that he made to the daughter of Herodias? And for whom, at that passing moment, but for the beautiful daughter, would he have dared to shed the sainted blood of John the Baptist to redeem that promise?

In speaking of the French Revolution, Lamartine says,—“Of all the passions of the people, their hatred was the most flattered; they made it suspicious in order to subject it.” If this passion was the most flattered, it would find its centre in that passion which is the most powerful and active—which is sexual love. And in regard to female influence during this period, Lamartine adds:—“The first act of the people was to degrade superior authority. The *esprit de caste* impelled the nobility to emigrate, the *esprit de corps* similarly influenced the officers, and the *esprit de cour* made it shameful to remain on a soil stained with so many outrages to royalty. The women, who then formed public opinion in France, and whose tender and easily excited imagination is soon transferred to the side of their victims, all sided with the throne and aristocracy. They despised those who would not go and seek their avengers in foreign lands. Young men departed at their desire; those who did not, dared not show themselves. They sent them distaffs, as a token of their cowardice.²

During the American Revolution, indeed, it may be said of all public commotions where human nature is developed, the women have had their parts to act, and the parts assigned to them have been particularly adapted to their highest, or to their lowest nature, as women. In New York the Tories were greatly indebted to unprincipled women.³ It was said of the wives and children of the Tories, as partisans, that they were much worse than the men.⁴ British wives were regarded as more dangerous than their husbands,⁵ and when ministers desired information which they could not obtain by direct intercourse they employed women.⁶ Women were employed to act both as spies and counsellors.⁷ “We examined six or

¹ Esdras, III: 4.

² Hist. Girondists, Vol. I, pp. 40, 187.

³ Paine's Polit. Writings, Vol. I, p. 115.

⁴ Am. Archives, 4th S., Vol. III, p. 852.

⁵ Life of President Reed, Vol. II, p. 147.

⁶ Am. Archives, 4th S., Vol. II, p. 182.

⁷ Life of President Reed, Vol. II, p. 274, and Am. Archives, 4th S., Vol. VI, p. 429.

seven women," says Gov. Livingston, in a letter to Gen. Washington,¹ "who came from New York, and though they appear to be Whigs, and had part of their effects and near relations amongst us, have a number of stories to tell, which, though probably told with no ill intention, yet have a natural tendency to discourage the weaker part of our inhabitants. For my part I am utterly against this kind of communication between this State and New York, and could earnestly wish the officers under your command would be as sparing as possible of their permissions. The sex are mistresses of infinite craft and subtlety, and I never heard or read of a great politician who did not employ petticoats to accomplish his designs."² Here, in justice to true statesmanship, and to show his contempt for the intriguing politician, the Governor adds,—“Certain it is that the greatest politician on record, I mean the devil, applied himself to a female agent to involve mankind in sin and ruin.”³ It was a remark of Dean Swift in one of his letters,—“that the best intelligence he got of public affairs was from the ladies.” As his information seldom proved to be correct, it remains to be shown whether his inaccuracies were in the intelligence received or in the language of his communications.

To the peculiar influence of woman in the affairs of government, neither Jefferson, nor Franklin was an indifferent observer. In a letter to Gen. Washington, dated at Paris, Dec. 4th, 1788, Jefferson says,—“In my opinion, (speaking of France,) a kind of influence which none of their plans of reform take into account, will elude them all; I mean the influence of women, in the government. The manners of the nation allow them to visit, alone, all persons in office, to solicit the affairs of the husband, family, or friends, and their solicitations bid defiance to laws and regulations. The obstacle may seem less to those who, like our countrymen, are in the precious habit of considering right as a barrier against all solicitation. Nor can such an one, without the evidence of his own eyes, believe in the desperate state to which things are reduced in this country from the omnipotence of an influence which, fortunately for the happiness of the sex itself, does not endeavor to extend itself in our country beyond the domestic line.”⁴

¹ Am. Archives, 5th S., Vol. III, p. 517.

² That woman by nature was not created to lead in public affairs has been the judgment of people of all nations during all time:—“*The hen does not announce the morning*,” was an ungallant, but ancient proverb of the Celestial Empire, 1200 years B. C. At this period—a beautiful woman was preferred to all other presents to redeem a prisoner in the hands of the Chinese Emperor.—*Shoo-King*, p. 191.

³ On an exciting occasion, May, 2d, 1788, “a party of Amazons,” as Lady Mary W. Montagu calls them, headed by the Duchess of Queensbury and Ancaster, stormed the House of Lords, and disturbed the debate, “not only by smiles and winks, but by noisy laughs and apparent contempts, which is supposed,” she adds, “to be the true reason why poor Lord Hervey spoke so miserably.”—*Hervey's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. LL.

⁴ Jefferson's Works, Vol. II, p. 536.

In a letter to his wife, dated at London, June 10th, 1758, Dr. Franklin writes,—“ You are very prudent not to engage in party disputes. Women never should meddle with them, except in endeavors to reconcile their husbands, brothers, and friends, who happen to be of contrary sides. If your sex keep cool, you may be the means of cooling ours the sooner, and restoring more speedily that social harmony among fellow citizens, that is so desirable after long and bitter discussions.”¹

Thus, in all times, and by eminent men of all countries, this question has been discussed ; but rather, as one of an incidental nature than one to be deliberately considered by statesmen, and acted upon by legislators. History is full of instruction upon it,—and it may, or may not be regarded as a matter of regret that it cannot receive a more extended notice in this place. Should the reader, however, be disposed to pursue further this inquiry, he might be able to limit his analysis somewhat, by observing the terms as stated in a proposition by Dean Swift—in which he simply asserts the facts of nature. “ There were two passions in the human heart,” he says, “ superior to the government and control of reason, and which were planted there by a particular Providence ; these were, *the love of life*, and *the love of the sexes*.” He stated this as a maxim. It was repeated as such in the British Parliament a hundred years ago with the remark, “ that these passions were wisely planted in our bosoms for the preservation and happiness of the species, and no human law could possibly destroy or even diminish them.”² He will find much that is profoundly instructive on this subject in the Bible. Also in the works of Aristotle.³ Virgil and Lucretius appreciated more the romance than the philosophy of love. On this as on all other subjects, the pages of Shakespeare constitute a fountain of wisdom, but his opinions, like flowers, are to be selected by a discriminating judgment to show their teachings. Burton saw much both in man and woman to laugh at, and if his readers fail to find profit in his mirth, they may find practical knowledge in his facts. Montaigne pictured nature in her

¹ Sparks' Franklin, Vol. VII, p. 168.

² Parl. Deb. Vol. XXII, p. 400.

³ In speaking of “ the state of body most likely to supply the commonwealth with good children,” he gives practical counsel to both sexes. He says,—“ Winter is the fittest season for consummating marriage ; and, as naturalists tell us, when the wind blows from the north.” For preventing evils of excess, of any kind, he says,—“ the legislator should enjoin his countrywomen, when pregnant, to walk daily to the temples, and pay their devotions to the

powers presiding over child-birth. At the same time the female mind, in this delicate situation, should be diligently attended to, neither soured by neglect nor ruffled by passion, but amused by images of pleasure, and soothed into unalterable serenity ; for plants do not more certainly indicate the soil from which they spring, than children receive and reflect the temper of their parents.”—“ *Ethics and Politics*,” Vol. II, p. 246. Such instructions to husbands and fathers, if not to legislators—would be valuable even in our days.

freedom and frolics, but he said but little to aid her in the restraints necessary to refinement. But in his essay on Love, Lord Bacon embodies the subject in a single sentence:—"Nuptial love maketh mankind; friendly love perfecteth it; but wanton love corrupteth and embaseth it."

But to conclude this chapter: If one would solve the mystery of woman's power he must be able first to measure the vast domain of love that is guarded by the countless and sleepless eyes of jealousy. As used in the Bible, this word denotes godly indignation against the diversion of love and service from their proper objects. In its dire perversions, jealousy has been denominated by the poets,—“a hag,” “a monster,” “an infernal fury,” “a hell,” “the pain of pains.” With unsurpassed power and completeness, Shakespeare in *Othello*, has delineated this passion in its frightful intensity, and bitter miseries. His visions of light and darkness, of heaven and hell, of happiness and misery, in close proximity, are made startling realities. *Othello* is placed upon the verge of each condition to contemplate the deep and narrow chasm that divides the heaven which he can see, from “the spite of hell,” which he cannot imagine. Without the possession of his wife in her purity, he impiously bewails life as a cruel delusion, and invokes oblivion as comparative bliss. In the scale of jealous love the weight of a single woman in her faithfulness is greater than God and heaven, the world and the universe. These are the extremes of existence, and comprehend all the relations of life.

Jealousy has been called a disease, a malady of the mind. This is an error. It is confounding the abuse of the passion with its exalted objects. It is enumerated by naturalists as one of the instincts of Birds and Animals, and the history of its manifestations in works on Zoölogy and Ornithology is highly interesting and instructive. It illustrates the law upon which the continuance of the different species mainly depend. The ancients recognized it in their Mythology, and many of the cruel and wonderful achievements of the gods were instigated by its irresistible activity.

When interpreted, however, by philosophy and religion, it is found to be an invulnerable shield to protect the sexes in their highest purity and dignity. It is seen to be the frenzy of all the passions united into one to guard in woman what belongs to man, and in man what belongs to woman. It is the spirit of love in its purity, of honor in its integrity, and of justice in its conceded rights. It is the sentinel of home consecrated by the loyalty of the sexes; the guardian of happiness made perfect by the constant observance of the natural laws. It lovingly confides without disguise, and nobly concedes freedom without meanness. What possession is to property, jealousy is to the soul. It grasps its own. All the faculties and instincts of mind have their appointed functions. These are governed by unalterable laws. Every faculty, sentiment and propensity,—has each its own indestructible sphere in nature, and though they may be often violated,

they never can be abrogated. They all have a voice in jealousy.

Man and woman have a joint existence. Whatever they think or do, should be for the good of both. Whatever they propose or desire, should be enjoyed together. Whatever they possess should be alike protected by the same laws. In this joint existence inhere all the duties, rights and privileges of life. The best good of one, is the best good of all. Human happiness, like the globe, is divided into two hemispheres, one for man and one for woman; but the sphere is complete only when both are united.

It may be asked :—What has the subject of woman, to do with democracy? Much. More than can be written. As daughter, maiden, sister, lover, wife and mother,—numbering one-half of the human family; the peerless beauty of creation, the heart of affection, the soul of home; the first teacher of children, the life companion of man, the joyous refiner of society,—woman stands at the fountain-head of all human joys, blessings and happiness. The gushing streams from this inexhaustible fountain are made pure by her filtering hand, and beauteous by the magic eloquence of her smiles and beaming eyes. Without her, democracy could have no beginning, and with her, democracy can have no end. God has so blended her with man in the paths of love and duty, that both would be lost if one were to try the journey of life without the other.

But enough of prose. This subject belongs to the poet. Let TENNYSON close the chapter on woman :

“ For woman is not undeveloped man,
But diverse: could we make her as the man,
Sweet love were slain, whose dearest bond is this
Not like to like, but like in difference:
Yet in the long years liker must they grow;
The man be more of woman, she of man;
He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care:
More, as the double-natured poet, each:
Till at the last she set herself to man,
Like perfect music unto noble words;
And so these twain upon the skirts of Time,
Sit side by side, full-summ’d in all their powers,
Dispensing harvest, sowing the *to-be*,
Self-reverent each, and reverencing each,
Distinct in individualities,
But like each other e’en as those we love.
Then comes the statelier Eden back to men,
Then reign the world’s great bridal, chaste and calm;
Then springs the crowning race of human-kind!”

As the Duchess of Marlborough was a most prominent and active personage in the reign of Queen Anne, it is proper that some further attention should be given to the consideration of her character.

THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

The Duchess of Marlborough is entitled to some defence against the many aspersions cast upon her temper as a woman. History has not done her full justice. Horace Walpole speaks of her experience as of "sixty years of arrogance." The confidence of a superior judgment and of knowledge is not arrogance. If she had been a man, and had uttered the same language, the same opinions, the same sentiments, and urged them with the same energies,—which all agree in attributing to her, she would have been numbered among the ablest statesmen of her time. A woman cannot use the manly language of a statesman, without misapprehension and disadvantage. Boldness is called insolence, promptness petulance, and impatience anger. According to Swift, the Duchess was the victim of "three furies which reigned in her breast, the most mortal of all softer passions, which were, sordid avarice, disdainful pride, and ungovernable rage." It was very difficult for Swift to see merit in political opponents. He would be slow to see virtue in frugal ambition, to discover noble aspirations in pride, or to discriminate between ungodly anger and righteous indignation. That the Duchess was a good manager of property, and had a commendable ambition to increase it with distinct motives to its uses;¹ that she had great pride, in harmony with other faculties, and did not disguise it in all her plans and purposes; that she had strong and active passions, which were easily and naturally excited under circumstances sufficient fully to explain and justify their unrestrained manifestation, no one, probably, acquainted with her history, would be disposed to doubt. But, with a husband, such as Lord Marlborough, the greatest character of the age; with an early position of influence within the circles of royalty, and of the courts of Europe; with an almost unlimited power of patronage, and unsurpassed influence which personal beauty ever commands;² with an

¹ The Duchess of Marlborough, who, of all her class, was the first to detect the fallacy of the South Sea Bubble. When the value of the stock rose to an unprecedented height, and the public were more than ever infatuated by false hopes, she saved her husband and her family from ruin, not only by her foresight but by her firmness. She left a legacy of ten thousand

pounds to Wm. Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, for the noble defence he made in support of the laws of England, and to prevent the ruin of his country.—*Mrs. Thomson's Memoirs*, Vol. II, pp. 811, 504.

² Beautiful according to the opinion of her contemporaries, her beauty indeed appears in the portraits painted in her bloom of youth, to have been commanding as well as interest-

accurate knowledge of human nature, and keen perceptions of its follies and weaknesses, and of the necessary means to meet and master them; with a comprehensive judgment of the wants of a great nation, and of its limited and uncertain means of supplying them,—nothing less than an energetic action, a display of sentiments corresponding with high and pure motives, an ambitious spirit and lofty pride—would have been natural, or equal to the emergencies of her individuality. “Sordid avarice,” is a mean spirit, with no motives beyond itself; “disdainful pride,” is the insolence of vanity, and senseless; and “ungovernable rage,” indicates the want of mind, the want of judgment. Such opinions are not applicable to the Duchess of Marlborough, whose marked qualities were almost of an opposite nature. Her love of property was mainly in view of its uses; her pride was a natural consciousness of her own great powers and cherished wishes; and her rage, but an undisguised expression of indignation at culpable wrong, or perhaps an inconsiderate contempt of unaccountable stupidity. She was called “a good hater,” but no one accused her of liking what was bad, or of hating what was good.¹ This quality was valued by Dr. Johnson as an evidence of principle. She was said to have been a tyrant over Anne, and her enemies accused her of ingratitude, arrogance and intrigue. The stream of such qualities is more likely to flow from the lesser to the greater capacity. But, if such charges were sustained by facts, in any degree, it could be asserted without hesitation, that no one of her time and standing, was more innocent of their meaning, or less chargeable with their application.²

It cannot be denied, however, that her participation in public affairs had

ing. Her figure is asserted to have been peculiarly fine, and her countenance was set off by a profusion of fair hair, which she is said to have preserved without its changing color, even at an advanced age, by the use of honey-water. Several years after she had become a grandmother, the freshness of her lovely complexion, and her unfaded attractions, caused her, even in the midst of four daughters, each distinguished for personal charms, to be pre-eminent among those celebrated and high-bred belles.”—*The Life of Colley Cibber*.

¹ She evidently understood her own peculiarities. In a letter to Mr. Schroepe, she says,—“I am very glad that you like what I am doing, and though you seem to laugh at my having vapours, I cannot help thinking you have them sometimes your-

self, though you don't think it manly to complain. As I am of the simple sex, I say what I think without any disguise; and I pity you very much for what a man of sense and honesty must suffer from those sort of vermin, which I have told you I hate, and always avoid.”

² It was more her judgment, than her pride or passion, that influenced her to exclude the Tories, as much as possible, from the presence of the Queen. In explaining her personal hostility to Lord Rochester, she declares “that she could have forgiven his lordship's ill-treatment of herself if she had thought that he had sought to promote the Queen's true interest. But the gibberish of that party,” alluding to the Tory party, “about non-resistance, and passive obedience, and hereditary right, I

a tendency, in some degree, to change the delicacy and grace that give charms to woman into ruder habits of thought and action. This was her sacrifice or misfortune, and was the natural consequence of her constant and familiar intercourse with public men and on business in which her husband was deeply concerned, and which did not permit the exercise of those refining qualities so necessary to the perfection of character in the true woman, the wife and the mother. It proved to be her exalted mission and for which no one had more appropriate endowments, to represent the great principles of democracy under extraordinary tests and difficulties—and in a period marked by the unbounded schemes of an unprincipled party and reckless ambition. No man could have filled her place. She was the cherished bosom companion of royalty, a Tory Queen, whose chief counsellor was the gifted and brilliant Bolingbroke, the bright hope of Toryism itself. She was the wife and joy of the Great Duke of Marlborough who held in his hands the turning destiny of nations. Who, while he was moving the mighty armies of the Grand Alliance to establish peace and justice in Europe, and awake to the ready means of triumph in the field and cabinet abroad,—was blindly and confidently looking for aid and support from a Tory government at home. Who, but a loving and beautiful wife, nerved and elevated by “the pride of purity”—could teach the hardy soldier the mysteries of party and statesmanship against the influences of example and education? With no annoying apprehensions of ignorance or of doubt, and armed with the simple but mighty convictions and appliances of truth and duty,—she approached the outward forms and insignia of greatness with an instinctive courage and an unerring foresight that only can be found in that “desire of fame where justice gives the laurel.” She demonstrated the immeasurable difference in woman between the prerogatives of royalty moved by the influences of error, and of the intellect and heart armed with the power of truth. With skill and wise discrimination she displayed the instructive contrast between the minds of a democratic woman and a Tory statesman. And, by the sway of deep affection and persistent reason,—she converted the capacious mind of the greatest military hero of the world from the delusions of toryism to the privileges of democracy.

could not think it forboded any good to my mistress, whose title rested on a different foundation.”—*Conduct*, p. 182. In another place she plainly admits, “I did speak very freely and very frequently to Her Majesty upon the subject of Whig and Tory, according to my conception of their different views and principles.” This was counsel, not tyranny. In her last bitter inter-

view with the Queen she boldly demanded to know the charges against her, and their authors. The Queen would give no answer. The Duchess gives an account of it in her own language, and says, “I shall make no comment upon it. Yet,” she adds with magnanimity, “the Queen always meant well, however much soever she may be blinded or misguided.”

That she was not controlled by the dogmatists of theology is certain. That she made for herself a good record for integrity, purity of character and directness of purpose, at all times and without respect to persons, is equally true. "She tumbled out her mind," apparently unconscious of the petty restraints of policy, and no one was ever deceived or misled by her flattery. It was impossible for her to act the hypocrite, and if she was "impetuous" in her speech, it proceeded rather from urgent and important considerations of truth against error,—than from the want of distinct motives, or the recklessness of ignorance. Considering that she was in love with a Tory, it was evidence of her greatness that she chose to be a democrat. Her opinions of the Tories, and of the dangers of their policy, were always expressed with a remarkable discernment of public exigencies, and with a spirit of justice. Her standing as a Whig, was marked by intelligence, consistency, and prompt action. She was at once a vigilant observer, a ready learner, and an honest adviser. She did not act without giving cogent reasons for her faith, and she often showed that she was above the influence of corruption, and the temptations of titles and office.¹ That she gave her mind to politics was neither singular nor strange, considering her remarkable capacity and peculiar position. It was as natural in centering all her tastes and interests in public affairs identified with home, as the law of gravitation in taking all matter to a common centre. As she loved her husband with all the passions of a woman, highly endowed by nature and exalted by station, she saw no other course that would enable her to understand his motives, movements, and acts, and to participate in public affairs sufficiently to allow her to measure his wants and to share the satisfaction of his glorious achievements. She could trace the injustice of his enemies, and solve the intrigues of party. So long as her husband lived, she could not but follow him in his eventful career. Her life was in him, and his deeds were made her own.² So long as he was identified with the progress

When her husband was honored by the Queen by a dukedom—she remarked,— "Ambition had no share in procuring that new title." She said also, "when I read the letter first upon it, I let it drop out of my hand, and was for some minutes like one that had received the news of the death of one of their dear friends; I was sorry for anything of that kind having before all that was of any use." She declined a pension offered by the Queen. The fact that she afterwards accepted it, was only conforming to the standard of principle which she thought she discovered

in the changed relations between the Queen and herself. "As to private interest," she says herself, "the Whigs could have done nothing for my advantage more than the Tories."—*Conduct*, p. 180.

² Even after his death, the Duchess refused the hand of the proud Duke of Somerset. That he was not of the same political sentiment showed that she commanded the respect of her opponents. She declined a second marriage as unsuitable to her age. She said, "that were she addressed by the emperor of the world, she would not permit him to succeed in that heart which had been

of nations and with their varying governments,—it was her choice, her nature, her happiness,—to study public affairs and to manifest a woman's interest in whatever concerned her husband's character and welfare. Just so far as she knew her husband's motives to be pure and good, it was natural that she should express her dislike to his enemies. If they were extremely unjust, who could censure her extreme dislike?

The Duke, with all his mighty cares, did not cease for a moment to love his wife with the liveliest passion of romance, and the sincerity of principle.¹ She fully reciprocated his devotion both by language and deeds. If she gave attention to the weighty affairs of state, it was natural that her womanly qualities should be lessened. She could not always be the lover, the friend, the wife and the mother. The sterner qualities of her nature were made active by the necessities of her heart and mind. It may be stated, too, as a beautiful fact, that while these qualities were seen by others, they did not lessen the love of her husband, although his party prejudices were adverse to her views. She understood political parties, and home statesmanship better than her husband. He endeavored to serve the nation without respect to parties as he was constantly subjected to the instructions of government. He had but little time to study the machinery of government. He was satisfied with its shape and operation. He looked for pleasure in his orders, and was satisfied to dwell more on its external relations than on the nice distinctions of its varying admin-

devoted to John, Duke of Marlborough."

When the Duchess of Buckingham lost her son, and liking public parades, she applied for the car which conveyed the remains of Marlborough to the tomb, the Duchess replied with feeling,—“It carried my Lord Marlborough, it shall never carry any other.”—*Thomson's Memoirs*, Vol. II, pp. 373, 378.

¹ In the hurry of military movements, in the excitement of unparalleled triumphs, his heart was ever with her. “I am heart and soul yours,” was his constant expression. “I can have no happiness till I am quiet with you,” “I cannot live away from you.” Again, he beautifully concludes one letter:—“Put your trust in God as I do, and be assured that I think I can't be unhappy as long as you are kind.” “Pray believe me,” he says, writing in 1705, immediately after the battle of Ramillies, “when I assure you that I love you

more than I can express.”—*Thomson's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 173.

After leaving England for the Hague, the Duchess wrote to her husband, offering to join him, to share in the anxieties and even in the dangers, to which he was exposed. His reply was full of affection. He says,—“Your letter of the 15th April came to me but this minute, (May 5.) My Lord Treasurer's letter, in which it was enclosed, by some mistake was sent to Amsterdam. I would not for anything in my power it had been lost; for it is so very kind, that I would in return lose a thousand lives, if I had them, to make you happy.” * * * “It will be a great pleasure to me to have it in my power to read this dear, dear letter often, and that it may be found in my strong box when I am dead. I do this minute love you better than I ever did in my life before.”

istration. His want of confidence in party was proof that he did not fully comprehend the nature of progress. The fact that he was compelled to see the difference between the Whig and Tory parties by their conduct towards himself; to leave the latter and to trust the former, was a practical lesson he was slow to learn and unlikely to forget. He opened his eyes to see the foresight and wisdom of his wife confirmed. He began to sympathize with her in her party views, and to see that there was no public safety but in the democracy of the nation. He was made a democrat by the realities of experience. He found the living principle upon which government depends. That he was more or less controlled by his wife before he ceased to be a Tory there can be no doubt. That she saw the true condition of the country when threatened by revolution, though ignorant as to the remedy, no one could question. That she should exert her influence over Princess Anne to leave her father, when deserted by others, was an event to be expected. Her husband well understood the character and position of James, and if he did not promptly coöperate to save him from disgrace, it was because he did not clearly see the means of success. He saw, too, the necessity of relief to the nation, and the common report that he, as well as the Princess, was constantly advised by the Duchess, was not without good foundation. That he preferred patriotism to a false loyalty, and duty to the nation in preference to mistaken gratitude to a perjured king, was much to his honor.

When Anne became Queen, the crown added nothing to her mind; and when the Duchess began to serve the Queen, instead of her friend, Mrs. Morley, her mental powers were no less. It has been remarked, that "The Duchess of Marlborough's dismissal from Anne's favor may be said to have commenced, in reality, when that Princess ascended the throne of England. The favorite was now wholly devoted to Whig principles; Anne was always, in her heart, a Tory. Lady Marlborough could ill brook opposition from one whose actions she had for years guided, and who had scarcely dared to move except at her bidding."¹ *Daring* against arbitrary power, and *daring* against superior ability and knowledge—are very different acts. A bitter assailant of the Duchess,² says,—“Flattery, madam, is what you never happened to be accused of, nor of temporizing with the humors of your royal patroness. The peccadillos you have been supposed answerable for, are of quite a contrary class—of playing the tyrant with your sovereign, of insisting on your own will in opposition to hers, and of carrying your own points with a high hand, almost whether she would or not.”³ Such language might be applicable to persons of equal ability, of

¹ Thomson's *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 312.

² "Other Side of the Question," p. 11.

³ There is much truth in the language of Mrs. Thomson, respecting a peculiarity of

the same station, or of different stations. But a distinction should be made between the counsel of knowledge and the will of ignorance.

It is a base insinuation of Swift, when speaking of Godolphin, gravely to adopt a slander of the infamous Mrs. Manly. He says,—“His alliance with the Marlborough family, and his passion for the Duchess, were the cords which dragged him into a party which he naturally disliked, whose leaders he personally hated, as they did him.” Lord Marlborough was not disposed to question the motives of others, when approached with friendly assurances. The Duchess was slow to believe a friend who had ever proved himself capable of change. This was well illustrated when her husband was complimented by William, when he appointed him governor of the young Duke of Gloucester. He received the distinction with evident pleasure, but she could not forget that both had suffered indignities from the hand now ready to honor them.

As extreme measures generally destroy themselves, compromise becomes the first remedy. A middle party, led by Robert Harley,¹ significantly called “trimmers,” “gradually and silently arose,” says an intelligent writer, “and, fostered by circumstances, attained a powerful ascendancy.” With such a leader, no policy but that of intrigue could be expected, and with an unprincipled faction, no results but those of injustice and disgrace were possible. This break from the Tory party was doubtless caused by a discerning ambition to escape from error and its responsibilities. A leading partisan, confident in his doubts, is sure to have a respectable number of followers. All parties, however, when they have reached the extreme limits of wrong and error, are generally permitted by Providence to return to the right with avowed motives that pride disguises, and charity concedes.

MEASURES AND PARTY FEATURES OF THE REIGN OF ANNE.

The questions particularly discussed during the reign of Queen Anne

her own sex. She says,—“There is always something in female altercations that is ludicrous as well as painful. Few women know how and where to stay the course of anger; when it once begins to flow, every charm, every grace so fondly prized by the sex is obliterated, when retort follows retort, and retaliation grows vigorous; and dignity, to assert which the fair sex is oftentimes so valiant, takes its departure immediately we become vociferous in its defence.”—*Memoirs, Duchess of Marlborough*, Vol. I, p. 192.

says,—“His humor was never to deal clearly, nor openly, but always with reserve, if not dissimulation, or rather simulation, and to love tricks, even where not necessary, but from an inward satisfaction he took in applauding his own cunning. *If any man was under the necessity of being a knave, he was.*”—*Diary, Ms.* p. 16: Pope says of him, he was “above all pain, all anger, and all pride.” This made him incapable of sense, indignation and self-respect. A no-party man, as he would have preferred to make Steele.

¹ In speaking of Harley, Lord Cowper

were most important to England, and to humanity. The succession to the throne, the divine right of Kings, Papacy, and Protestantism,—indeed, the great issues of the Revolution were reviewed and considered under the peculiar circumstances of threatened danger abroad, and of a singular mixture of strength and weakness, and of division and subdivision at home. Her reign was marked by extreme violence of party. This was the natural result of official weakness. The nervous Queen was considered as mere property, “which was to be engrossed, divided, or transferred, as suited best with the mercenary views of those state-brokers who had the privilege of dividing the spoil.”¹ When state authority is feeble, the ship of state, like that of the mariner without a wind after a storm, is thrown from side to side and made to flounder, there being no outward nor inward force to impel her forward on her way. The Queen with no impelling power but that of party prejudice, with a husband regarded as nothing above “an obliging cypher,” and with no discriminating judgment above sentiment or passion, allowed herself to be alternately swayed by the hopes and fallacies of the Tories, who cared for nothing but party, and by her own fears when warned by experience that she was wrong, and the Whigs were right.²

In one thing, all parties were agreed, and that was hostility to France. War was regarded an inevitable condition of national safety,—and yet its glorious successes served only to multiply obstacles to peace, or to instigate new measures of injustice. The victories of Marlborough were celebrated by all, and though England in consequence of them, was first made the leading power of Europe, yet the party advisers of the Queen were incapable of comprehending the true interests of the government, or of appreciating the source either of its growing strength, or the means of perpetuating it. Marlborough, “the greatest of generals and the greatest of ministers,” exhausted the energies of genius and the sources of knowledge in his extraordinary endeavors to serve the cause of nations, in their special and universal rights and interests, having at the same time to bow to the humiliating weaknesses of royalty, and still to acknowledge the binding obligations of the Tory party. His lot was indeed a difficult one. He had one of the weakest and most obstinate of women to influence him by the aids of roy-

¹ Cunningham, b. ix, p. 77. Thomson's *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 81.

² In a note to the Duchess (1706) the Queen says,—“I believe, dear Mrs. Freeman, we shall not disagree as we have formerly done; for I am sensible of the services those people have done me, that you have a good opinion of, and will countenance

them; and I am thoroughly convinced of the malice and insolence of others that you have been always speaking against.” —*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 376. The Whigs had opposed the proposal to invite to the kingdom the electress Sophia,—a proposition which had given great offence to the Queen.

alty and prejudices of party in the person of the Queen. In the person of his wife, he had a bright and beautiful example of loveliness combined with the spirit of intelligence, truth and candor. She saw with clearness the character of men, and she was a wise counsellor in the difficult business of appointments to office. He loved her more than he loved his life. With her, he was willing to give up the world; without her, the world was nothing to him. His loyalty to the crown, and his devotion to the Church,—had no rival sentiment but that of conjugal love. Though constantly drawn away from domestic scenes, by his deep sense of public duty, his heart knew no home but in the affections of his beloved wife. More than any, her influence was supreme. It was the influence of woman as woman. If a Whig statesman had uttered the same opinions in the same language, they would probably have been unheeded. Her troubles grieved him more than his own, her differences perplexed him more than the dangers of war, or the inconsistencies of state. Such a wife can have no better defence than in such conduct of such a husband.

When he was compelled to doubt the wisdom and the policy of the Tory party, by what he saw and by the apt instructions of the Duchess; and to see that the enemies of his country rejoiced in Tory successes,—he was tempted to believe that extremes were only to be avoided, and that a middle course was the wisest. When forced to realize the uncertainties and absurdities of compromise, in violation of principle, he was willing to be persuaded that all parties were equally wrong and false. He looked to royalty for a principle, to government without a policy for a guide,—and saw safety only in the *no party* doctrine, or in the unproductive desert of neutrality. He did not seem to understand, to use the language of Prof. Smyth, —“that in a mixed and free government like that of England, all questions that either occupy or deserve to occupy attention have a reference either to the prerogative of the crown or privileges of the people, to religious toleration, to mild or harsh government, to peace and war, or finally, to some of the more important subjects of political economy; that suspense in all these cases is impossible; that honest men, therefore, vote with those who best promote such *systems* and *principles* as they approve; that in this manner are disposed of, and ranged on *different* sides, the men of *political integrity*; and that the remainder are those who are in the habit of thinking all questions matters of indifference, and of joining the men or the ministers who are most likely to furnish their relations or themselves with emoluments and offices; but that such men are, and always have been, the proper objects of the suspicion and contempt, not only of the public, but of the very House itself, and it is impossible to suppose that they can be necessary to the stability of any good government,—certainly not in any greater number than the infirmity of human nature will always produce them, after every possible political expedient and contrivance has been

resorted to, for the purpose of diminishing their number and weakening their efficiency."¹

It was not until Marlborough saw that royalty could be diverted from duty by ordinary servants, that favorites of the sovereign could become the dispensers of the royal patronage, even including counsellors of the state, and at the sacrifice of one, who, of all in the world, he loved best, that he was willing openly to trust the Whigs, and distrust the Tories. He soon found that a mixed policy presented no system of action, and yielded no definite results. That it led to unscrupulous intrigues for place of weak and unprincipled men, who, having been opponents, had joined in a doubtful alliance, and with narrow and selfish purposes. He began to question himself whether the standard of loyalty was to be found in the constitution itself, or in the person of its chief servant. The Queen could not understand the meaning or the safety of the prerogatives of the crown but in the dogmas of the Church or the Tory party, and she was piously willing to indulge in personal and party resentments to the exclusion of wise counsel proffered by able and honest statesmen, because they were Whigs.² She manifested much alarm when Marlborough and Godolphin expressed a desire to retire from official position. The same feeling was expressed on the possibility of losing her dear friend, Mrs. Freeman,—but there was no change too absurd to be reconciled in her philosophy. She could not see the difference between sentiment and opinion. She could see no good reason why her opinion, without knowledge, was not as safe as any other opinion formed in accordance with knowledge. She was made to believe that she was Queen only when the Tories were in power, and that the nation was safe only when the Whigs were out of power. With her, loyalty was Toryism, and Toryism the government. A Whig in official position was deemed an obstacle to government, and the policy advised by the Whig party an inevitable evil to be borne but not to be sanctioned. She found herself compelled often to participate in public measures which she could neither withdraw nor direct, and she was often congratulated upon results, which were glorious to the nation, but which were achieved by a policy of her political opponents. The diversity of advice given by party friends embarrassed her,—for when the Tories were the strongest in power, they were most divided in counsel. This is ever the party condition of ignorance and error.

Nothing, certainly, was left undone by Mrs. Freeman to make Mrs. Morley a Whig, and no fact in history is deemed more certain,—that she

¹ Modern History, p. 413

life had preserved the Tory government for

² Hallam says,—“It is impossible to a few years, every vestige of the toleration doubt for an instant, that if the Queen's would have been effaced.”

did not succeed. At one period both parties were balanced, and the court had its own way. To use a physical illustration, this was like a partial vacuum, and it was subject to irregular and external forces.

By rejecting the counsel of party men, the Duke soon found that both parties became his enemies. Nothing but hard and bitter experience led him to the conclusion that whatever special power he could exert with commanding and irresistible influence, he could not detach himself, nor the Armies of the Allies from the government to which he was made accountable, nor could he sever the government itself from the parties which surrounded it. Each member of the Alliance had its own peculiar difficulties at home, and all, alike, were subject to the constant surveillance and discipline of party. No character in the world, finds it so difficult to do strict justice to a nation, to the people who pay taxes, to the soldier who is constantly exposed to danger and personal discomfort, to the cause of religion and humanity, which embraces most that makes up the blessings of home and of society,—as the commander of an army. He is placed in conflict with the motives of men of all classes, parties and conditions. He is expected to please alike the good man who asks peace, and the ambitious and resentful man who demands war. He is expected to satisfy the selfish man who seeks place, the corrupt man who sees no good but in public contracts, and the miserable wretch who gloats in blood-shed and robbery. Each political party is inclined to claim him as its own, if he be successful in the battle field, but if he fails he is soon disowned by all parties. It matters not who it is, or what it is, that enables him to succeed, or causes him to fail,—he becomes either the undisparaged subject of glory, or the victim of unmitigated disgrace. Manly courage does not save him; the want of soldiers, ammunition, ordinance, or rations, is counted his misfortune, and not sufficient grounds for apology; the blunders of his official superiors and the unforeseen circumstances of his time and position; the vile intrigues of ambitious men, or of a desperate and revolutionary party, designed to defeat his plans, or to supplant his command,—are all accounted his ill-luck, or blunders by construction. Though history may justly record him a patriotic hero, yet the generation of his time is often found ready to deny him even common justice or decency.

No commander ever realized these truths to a greater degree than the Great Duke of Marlborough. Royalty not only did not save him,—but meanly and ungratefully signed and sealed his disgrace.¹ The Tory party

¹ On malicious charges which proved to be false, and without waiting for investigation, the Queen, January 1, 1712, “in a note written with her own hand, which is not extant, because, in a transport of indignation, the Duke threw it into the fire, dismissed him from all his employments.” In September of the same year, on the death of Lord Godolphin, the Duke and the Duchess left England, to reside abroad

was unwilling to save him, because it could not aid or use him politically. It was true to its natural instincts and conventional dogma. It abhors all growth it cannot limit, and denounces all skill it cannot direct. It was willing to acquire strength by attempts at assassination, and by appeals to frenzied passions.¹ His own church could not help him, for it was unable, alone, to take care of itself. Though the Allies could not do without him, yet, with the aid of all his victories they had but little power either to shape their own ends, or to shield him from slander. Greatness was limited and paralyzed by the want of means; and royalty, weakness and error were helpless for the want of knowledge and integrity. From a reverential loyalty, the Duke was gradually led to see that royalty was nothing without intelligence and honest counsel. From an abiding confidence in the Tory party he was by degrees enabled to see its fallacies, to doubt its motives and ability, and to detest its policy. It had abandoned the Alliance, it had opposed supplies, it had refused thanks for services, it had favored a discreditable peace, it had insulted the Queen, it had opposed Godolphin and himself, it had reconstructed the House of Lords for mere party purposes,—and in its varying course, had proved not only false to itself and to the Church, but to its opponents and to the country. With comprehensive views of military power, he was taught by experience, that battles were but slaughter, and victories crimes,—if not promptly used to promote the good of society and the peace of nations. Physical strength is always mostly in the governed, and the military is but an occasional arm to aid civil authority. With narrow and preconceived notions that the strength of a government depended more on the prerogatives of the crown, than on the eternal principles of justice and freedom, he opposed with uniform firmness, and even occasional bitterness, the only party that was able

until better times should return. The Queen coolly alluded to the event by remarking to the Duchess of Hamilton: "The Duke of Marlborough has done wisely to go abroad." She condescended however, to express her hopes that he would be well received in foreign parts. They did not return until after the Queen's death. They were then received by distinguished marks of attention, and he was honored by offers of place. These were declined. In regard to such offers the Duchess says,— "I begged the Duke of Marlborough upon my knees, that he would never accept any employment. I said, everybody that liked the Revolution and the security of the law, had a great esteem for him, that he had a

greater fortune than he wanted, and that a man who had had such success, with such an estate, would be of more use to any court than they could be to him; that I would live civilly with them, if they were so to me, but would never put it into the power of any King to use me ill. He was entirely of this opinion, and determined to quit all, and serve them only when he could act honestly and do his country service at the same time."—*Coxe's Memoirs*, VOL. III, p. 280. *Thomson's Memoirs*, VOL. II, p. 262.

¹ Guiscard's attempt to assassinate Harley, revived Harley's declining popularity. See *Coxe's Memoirs*, VOL. III, p. 196.

either to help him, or to save him. It was only necessary that he should review what he had attempted to do, and omitted to do; what he had done, and by whose aid; what he had not done, and by whose treachery,—to discover that there was but one power sufficient in itself to save the nation, and that was the statesmanship of democracy. When once persuaded of this great truth, he did not hesitate to disavow all respect for the Tory party, and to declare his confidence in the democratic. The Tories had disgusted him.¹ He lived to find that most of the disappointments and calamities of Queen Anne were attributable either to her obstinacy or weakness, to the Tory party or its tools. He lived to hear the cry of the people on the return of the Whigs to power, on his way to St. James,—“Long live King George, long live the Duke of Marlborough!”²

It was an interesting feature of Anne's reign, that Harley should introduce a friend to be his rival and enemy, and that both should be the means of illustrating the fate of renegade partisans, and the absurd fallacy of political coalitions. Harley had but a small chance of success opposed by such a powerful competitor as Bolingbroke, and he richly deserved to lose the influence of the Queen by the very means he employed to acquire it,—the cunning agency of Mrs. Masham. Harley, with ambitious motives, and with but little honesty,—was ready for any scheme that promised personal promotion, whether it was perfidy to the Queen, to the Whig cabinet, or to the Tory party. He hated most the obstacles in his way which he could not surmount. His old friend, of vastly superior ability, though possessing probably but little more honesty, Bolingbroke, stood in his path to turn him as he pleased. Both were well qualified to conduct the circuitous management of their own party, to league with the enemy of their country,³ to perpetuate the rule of the Stuart race, to subvert the constitution, and to substitute the Tory party in place of the government. Harley

¹ In a letter to his wife, May 5, 1710, the Duke writes,—“I do not doubt of the Whigs considering very well what resolutions it may be proper to take in this, I think, dismal conjuncture. You may be assured, and pray assure Lord Somers, Lord Sunderland, and whom they shall think proper, that I am determined to do just as they would have me, not only now, but in all the actions of my life.” * * * “Of all things the Whigs must be sure to be of one mind, and then all things, sooner or later, must come right.” Again, in October, he writes,—“The States, the Emperor, and the elector, all three have engaged me to con-

tinue with the army, which I suppose is, and will be approved by the Whigs; for I am resolved of doing nothing but in concert with them. I detest Mr. Harley; but I think I have lived long enough in the world to be able to distinguish between reason and faction.”—*Coxe's Memoirs*, Vol. III, pp. 68, 142.

² When the Duke tendered through Lord Sunderland, the resignation of his employments, the King, declared that “the Duke's retirement from office would excite as much pain as if a dagger should be plunged in his bosom.”

³ Louis.

ended his career by abusing his sovereign in her last hours. Bolingbroke, with all his plans and precautions to retain power, was unexpectedly led in an instant, to behold all his confident expectations and hopes suddenly blasted, and without a single chance of recovery. He had counted the Tory party omnipotent, and beyond all danger.¹ In his deep disappointment and hopeless despondency, he was led to exclaim,—“The grief of my soul is this: I see plainly that the Tory party is gone.” He had no words for his country, knowing that it would soon be in the safe keeping of the Democracy—which he had both maligned and betrayed.

The representative of royalty, Queen Anne,—though associated with greatness, deliberately rejected its aids, ignored its presence and influence, and often seemed to be either ignorant, or indifferent to its achievements and glories. She was conscious only of a nominal power, which failed when most wanted; of a friendship that had to be false when most needed; and of a judgment made impracticable with the most pains.² She was happy and fortunate in most of her opportunities, and in some of her acts when constrained by good counsel, and by circumstances which were inevitable. She was unhappy and unfortunate in her passions and prejudices, and in the choice of her friends and advisers. She could not comprehend the difference between prejudice and judgment, or between statesmanship and party. She could not distinguish between the party of arbitrary power and the party of the constitution,—and it was her lot to live without being able to appreciate the privileges of royalty, or to understand that no throne is permanently safe unless surrounded by the atmosphere of democracy.

She breathed her last in the presence of partisans who had deceived both her and themselves, and whose differences did not yield even in the presence of death, and whose untimely wrangles were permitted to add to its agonies and terrors.

In the death of Anne, the Stuart line was ended, and there was a permanent gain to the cause of freedom in England. In her reign the Tory party, by acquired strength, increased its difficulties, and lost its vigor; and royalty, by new and favored opportunities, lessened its power and endangered its prestige. Thus royalty in a woman, making her Queen, adds nothing to her ability to bless a nation, any more than it does in man—making him King. “Never,” wrote Dr. Arbuthnot to Dean Swift, “was

¹ The Tories claimed that there were throughout the Kingdom, eight Tories to one Whig. They probably had more than two to one.

² Of the Queen, Buckle speaks decidedly. He says,—“After the death of our great

King William III., the throne was occupied by a foolish and ignorant woman, whose love for the clergy would, in a more superstitious age, have led to dangerous results.”

—*Hist. of Civ. in Eng.*, Vol. I, p. 301.

sleep more welcome to a weary traveller than death to the Queen. It was frequently her lot, whilst worn with bodily suffering, to be an agitated and helpless witness of the bitter altercations of the Lord Treasurer Harley and of her Secretary of Foreign Affairs. It was her office, good-naturedly to check the sneers of the former, and to soothe the indignant spirit of Bolingbroke. In their mutual altercations, they addressed to each other such language as only cabinet ministers could use with impunity."¹ Only three days before the death of the queen, Harley was removed from the privy council, and for reasons stated by herself, viz: "His want of truth, his want of punctuality, 'the bad manners, indecency, and disrespect,' with which he treated her."²

In these brief and imperfect sketches it is not intended so much to give the political history of England as to afford a general summary of leading events with a view to show what they teach and the great truths they establish. A more extended reading of different and reliable authors, both of men and measures, would enable the reader to appreciate their purpose, which is, to illustrate the principles of political progress. To have a clear conception of the varied and confused reign of Anne, it is necessary so to classify the leading events that they may be studied as so many causes resolved into few, or many, and thus be able to trace them in a line to their legitimate results.³ In such an analysis are to be found, always, the character of the people at home, connected with established institutions, habits and customs, their industry, their commerce, their wants and their wealth. These conditions pervade society—independently of government and of party. In all organizations, whether for political or religious purposes, motives are to be found connected with private interests and personal preferences. Patriotism is a sentiment superadded to

¹ Swift's Correspondence, Vol. xv, p. 77.

² Thomson's Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 249.

³ Prof. Smyth says, "that it will require more than ordinary attention to understand the interior politics of this reign. The Whig and Tory Parties, though at a great distance from each other at their extreme points, were almost connected with each other by intermediate trimmers and shufflers of every description. Men of very discordant principles were often mixed up in the same cabinet. The queen was a decided Tory, and was always anxious to collect, or retain, as many Tories around her as possible. Marlborough and Godolphin were originally Tories, but were obliged gradually to depend more and more

on the Whigs, from the nature of the contest in which they were engaged." * * *

He alludes "to the manner in which the executive power can be restrained, and even controlled, by machinery not *avowedly* provided by the constitution for the purpose. For instance, Queen Anne carried on the war against France when neither her wishes nor her opinions were favorable to its continuance. The Whig administration remained in power long after they had become disagreeable to her; and Marlborough was her general, and even the arbiter of her councils at the conferences for peace, when neither he nor his Duchess any longer possessed her favor."—*Modern History*, pp. 414, 428.

all that is narrow and selfish, and comprehends the beautiful truth that what is really good for one is good for all. The love of country is the ultimate of human interests, and of human happiness.

GEORGE THE FIRST.

The incapacity of Anne to inaugurate new measures, or rather to execute old ones; her disposition to exalt party above the government, and politicians above statesmen, gave a period of rest to the nation that was important to its settlement and prosperity. The great truths of the Revolution had taken deep root in the minds and hearts of the people, and "the hereditary sceptre of a great and powerful empire passed from the hands of the ancient dynasty, without one act of violence or one word of opposition. The new dynasty, to which the mere declaration of the people had transferred it, succeeded as quietly as if they had been the immediate descendants of a long line of British Kings."¹

The Tories were, by far, the most numerous, but their party had been distracted by petty factions, and paralyzed by its dishonest schemes and impracticable measures. The leaders of the party were disappointed, and the unity of party was broken. A large majority of the land-holders adhered to this party, for it favored hereditary rights and special privileges. To some degree the feudal feeling survived feudalism, and the descendants of feudal lords indulged in a personal pride in that which had ceased to be an organized power. The clergy were Tories, by education, and the landlords and tenantry were so identified with similar interests, and influenced by similar teachings, that most political questions were discussed and decided by their rectors, and made to appear as binding as the apostles' creed. This was true of the smaller towns, where the people seldom met for discussion, and as seldom had access to political reading. In large cities the Whigs had the ascendancy.² The more extended relations of commerce

¹ This is the language of Cooke. He doubtless overlooked the fact recorded, that at Oxford, the Mayor received a letter brought by a person in a bachelor's gown, requiring him to proclaim the Pretender. In this letter were these expressions:—"This is to warn you, if you should receive an order to proclaim Hanover, not to comply with it, for the hand of God is now at work to set things upon a right foot, and in a few days you will see wonderful changes; which if you are wise enough to foresee, you will obtain grace and favor from the

hands of his sacred majesty King James," etc.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VII, p. 8.

² The French envoy, D'Iberville, professing to render an account to his court of the state of parties in England during this year, describes the Whigs as a thoroughly united party, boasting the best purses, the best swords, the most able heads, and the handsomest women. This party also he describes as the more rich in money and paper, the Tories in land.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 5.

and manufactures favored mental culture and activity,—and the objects of science, the practical uses of knowledge, and the ends of government,—became subjects of individual interest, and of public importance. Education was seen to be a necessity, and thinking a duty. The wars, from which England had just emerged,—had burdened the industry of the nation, and the changes of property had made great wealth for some, but poverty for the masses. The rich had increased their wealth, the poor their poverty.

George Lewis, under the title of George the First, ascended the throne, on the death of Queen Anne, Aug. 1, 1714.¹ He was born at the city of Hanover on the 28th of May, 1660, and was aged fifty-four years when proclaimed King. He was the eldest son of Ernest Augustus, Elector of Hanover, and Sophia Stuart,² daughter of Frederic, the Elector Palatine, and grand-daughter of James the First, of England.

He was educated with care, but more with reference to a military life than to the civil duties of a throne. Such was his taste, and it was claimed that he distinguished himself in the field. In 1681, he visited England as a suitor for the hand of the Princess Anne, but without success. He was secretly opposed by William, Prince of Orange. In 1682 he married his cousin Sophia Dorothea. He was an ordinary man without elegance, she was a beautiful and fascinating girl of sixteen. Their tastes were uncongenial, and their preferences soon diverged from conjugal love to mutual indifference and dislike. They sought happiness in opposite directions, and with equal disregard of principle, propriety and decency. He had his mistresses, she her gallants. Though blessed with two children, they derived no exaltation, or harmony, from parental affection.

These relations of alienated affection soon became known to the intriguers of the court, and were made use of by cunning and wicked aspirants for favor,—to secure means of advancement, or of personal revenge. She did not hesitate to declare an illicit love, and he made no effort to disguise his criminal indulgences. It was believed by some that he was the more guilty of the two, and yet he became the arbiter of her fate, and

¹ At the peace of Rastadt Louis XIV. was compelled to recognize the electoral dignity in the house of Brunswick-Lunenburg, as well as the right of the elector of Hanover to the succession to the British throne.—*Dr. Smucker's History of the Four Georges*, p. 23.

² Sophia was a woman of superior talent, and of great energy of character. She had the head of a statesman and philosopher

on the shoulders of a beautiful woman; and the passage of the Act of Succession by the British Parliament was in a great measure the result of the long-continued, skilful, and masterly intrigues which, during the progress of many years, she carried on with the leading minds in the British Government.—*Dr. Smucker's Hist. of the Four Georges*, p. 24.

inflicted a punishment upon her as cruel as it was unjust. A formal separation took place on the 28th of October, 1694, and she was condemned to imprisonment for life, and was denied the privilege of seeing her children.¹

It was claimed by the friends of George I., that he "had an excellent spirit and noble sentiments; he was more sensible of services than of injuries; courageous, little capable of dissembling or hiding his thoughts." "My maxim," said he, soon after his arrival in England, "is never to abandon my friends, to do justice to all the world, and to fear no man." "To these valuable qualities," the same writer adds,² "he joined a great application to business, and a sincere desire to render his subjects happy." Another eminent writer,³ who was appointed his first Secretary of State, complained that "seditious men endeavored to depreciate his majesty's person and family, without considering that his court at Hanover was always allowed to be one of the politest in Europe, and that before he became our King, he was reckoned among the greatest princes in Christendom." Addison's appreciation of his character, was highly complimentary. He said,—"The fickle and unsteady politics of our late British monarchs have been the perpetual source of those dissensions and animosities which have made the nation unhappy: whereas the constant and unshaken temper of his present majesty must have a natural tendency to the peace of his government, and the unanimity of the people."⁴ With no disposition to disparage the testimony of Addison, it is but proper that some allowance should be made in view of his official position, and that other writers of the same party should be consulted. A very intelligent and candid historian, of the present century,⁵ does not hesitate to say, that "George upon the throne of England was still only the Elector of Hanover; he was ignorant of the language, he hated the habits, he was even impatient of the acclamations of his new subjects. Lazy and inactive, and therefore lowly sensual, even in his pleasures, the ordinary duties of his station were to him intolerably wearisome; ⁶ his disregard of splendor, and his utter ignor-

¹ The unfortunate Sophia Dorothea, died at the Castle of Ahlden, after a tedious illness, Nov. 2, 1726. Before she expired she blessed her children, forgave her enemies and oppressors, and solemnly summoned her absent husband, the chief cause of her unjust suffering, as she asserted, to meet her at the judgment bar of God within a year after her death. The King died June 11th, 1727—nearly four months before her appointed time.—See *Dr. Smucker's Four Georges*.

² Tindall.

³ Addison.

⁴ Freeholder, p. 18.

⁵ George Wingrove Cooke, 1838.

⁶ "The hostile mob of Tories," says Dr. Smucker, "satirized his personal qualities, his ignorance of the language of his subjects, his heavy stupidity, his fondness for saur-kraut and punch, and above all his singular partiality for the detestably ugly, ungraceful, greedy, corpulent, and repulsive German women whom he still retained

ance of ambition, took from these onerous duties their corresponding reward; what wonder, therefore, that he thought little of the honor or advantage of a nation he did not understand, and in questions of foreign policy looked only to the interests of his own electorate." Still, the same author continues, "In his private character, although jealous and resentful, this prince was not without benevolence, and, although dull and phlegmatic, he was not destitute of ordinary ability, nor, when among those whose company he chiefly affected, even of pleasantry. A rare instance is recorded of a happy and ready repartee—too curious an achievement for George I. to be omitted:—At the time of the Scotch rebellion, Bishop Atterbury, so celebrated as a Jacobite, a scholar, and, as his contemporaries judged, a deist, was detailing to the King, with many expressions of affected sorrow, the progress the rebels had made. "My Lord Bishop," interrupted the King, "I fear the rebels as little as you do Jesus Christ."¹ Another writer, of marked ability, in a recent publication, says,—"The only thing recorded either of the sayings or doings of George I. during his whole life, which reflects any credit upon him, and deserves to be handed down with honor to posterity, is a remark which he made to a German nobleman, who congratulated him on being the sovereign at once of two such glorious kingdoms as England and Hanover. He replied: "Rather congratulate me on having such a subject as Newton in the one, and Leibnitz in the other." Yet it is doubtful whether the King deserved the credit of originality in making this remark: it was probably the echo of some graceful compliment paid him by one of his courtiers."²

The uncertainties of George I. commenced with his great grandfather, William, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenbergh, who had seven sons. The family not having sufficient means to sustain them all in a manner becoming their position, and future expectations,—they determined by lot which should be the representative of the blood. George, the sixth son, was the lucky man to be distinguished as the grandfather of George I. Had the Electress Sophia been more careful of herself and lived two months longer, she would have been entitled to receive the crown. Had the Dukes of Somerset and

around him as his mistresses." * * * "Madame Keilmansegge was described as being a mountain of fat, having two acres of cheeks, which were thickly covered with rouge. The appalling height of Madame Shulemberg was described as being the chief charm which won for her the King's favor." One of his first acts, on his return from a visit to Hanover, was to elevate his favorite mistress Keilmansegge to the peerage,—making her Countess of Leinster in

Ireland, Baroness of Brentford and Countess of Darlington in England. The illegitimate daughter of the King by the Duchess of Kendall, Melusina de Shulenburg was also created Baroness of Aldborough and Countess of Walsingham.—*Smucker's Four Georges*, pp. 43, 74.

¹ History of Party, VOL. II, p. 19.

² The Four Georges, by Dr. Smucker, p. 83.

Argyle failed to attend the council just preceding the death of Queen Anne, who could have insured the succession to the house of Hanover?¹ and is it likely that Bolingbroke would have had occasion so deeply to lament the death of his party? It has not been regarded a singular opinion, that the crown would have been retained by the Stuarts but for the statesmanship of Robert Walpole.² But such incidents connected with opinions are more curious than instructive. Providence leads, and feeble man is but a follower.

Although it was well known, at an early period, that the crown prince was a Whig, and gave no countenance whatever to Tories, still, they were not without hope and flocked about the King on his arrival in England, and with ardent manifestations of loyalty. They proposed to vote him a revenue beyond that enjoyed by the late queen,³ but as they failed to do this and saw but little encouragement that they were to be trusted, they soon demonstrated by their language and acts that their loyalty was only devotion to party. They were fully understood by the King, and the Whigs, and during the reign of George I. party spirit prevailed to a fearful extent. For a time party expedients appeared to constitute the political economy of the nation. It was at this period when Addison said, what has been quoted in another place,—“Our children are initiated into factions before they know their right hand from their left. They no sooner begin to speak, but Whig and Tory are the first words they learn. They are

¹ On the 27th of July, 1714—a cabinet council was held, at which the treasurer's staff was to be demanded from Oxford. The scene was most painful. The hatred between Oxford and Bolingbroke now broke forth in words; charges, threats and recriminations, passed between the rivals; and the falling minister in his reckless rage forgot his duty as a subject, and poured forth his abuse even upon his queen. This discussion was ended at half past two in the morning by the illness of the queen, who retired from the debate declaring she should not outlive it, and was carried to bed in a state of insensibility. When the council again met the queen was sunk into a lethargic state. They adjourned to the next day when she was able to be present. The debate was renewed, when the conclave was disturbed by the abrupt entrance of the Dukes of Somerset and Argyle. Bolingbroke and his friends regarded these intruders with undissembled alarm; but

Shrewsbury thanked them for their zeal, and invited them to take their seats at the table. They did so, and while the ministers were yet silent in astonishment, assumed the lead in the deliberations. Argyle moved that the council should address the queen to place the treasurer's staff in the hands of Shrewsbury. Bolingbroke, confused and dismayed, and unwilling to appear defeated, seconded the proposal, which was immediately carried. The queen declared they could not have named a better man. The energy which had thus wrested the government of this momentous crisis from the hands of the Tories was not suffered to relax.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. I, p. 610.

² Dr. Smucker, p. 82.

³ The Whigs proposed to continue the revenue which had been enjoyed by the late queen, but the Tories urged its augmentation to £1,000,000; the Whigs, however, defeated the movement.

taught, in their infancy, to hate one-half of the nation ; and contract all the virulence and passion of a party, before they come to the use of their reason."

The gifted and elegant Addison was at a loss how to understand this feature of perversity in the nature of man. He earnestly inquires,—“ What can we think of a party, who would plunge their native country into such evils as these ; when the only avowed motive for their proceedings is a point of theory, that has been already determined by those who are proper judges, in whose determination we have so many years acquiesced ? If the calamities of the nation can make no impression upon them, let them at least in pity to themselves, their friends, and dependents, forbear all open and secret methods of encouraging a rebellion, so destructive, and so unprovoked. All human probabilities are against them ; and they cannot expect success but from a miraculous interposition of the Almighty.”¹

It is not to be wondered that such a man as Addison should express his amazement at what he heard and saw, and that he should be unable to fathom the motives of able and educated men who were not only ready but forward to give their influence to a party whose leading characteristics were to accumulate power, and blindly to ignore principle. He was a party man. Not in the narrow sense marked by a selfish ambition. But as a philosopher, capable of distinguishing between truth and error. He saw, that while no party could be entirely in the right, it was a duty to be of that party not entirely in the wrong. He was a democrat,—made so by a well balanced mind, by an accurate knowledge of men, and of the principles of progress and of their practical applications in life. He looked upon government as an institution established solely for the permanent good of the governed. He looked upon man as an individual and as a member of society—bound by the ever changing obligations of a common humanity. He saw clearly that loyalty was an imperative duty, and that rebellion was a crime.² He looked upon party as an instrument unavoidably necessary to the strength and perpetuity of a constitutional government,—and while he deplored the excesses and errors of party spirit, he did not forget the wide distinction always to be observed, between the government itself and the administration of the government ; between patriotism and the right of resistance and disloyalty, and between loyalty and partisanship. His faith in principles was based upon knowledge, and though often tried by the inconsistencies of men with whom it was his lot to act,—he never permitted it either to be overridden by doubt, or displaced by fear or interest. If he had occasion to lament the want of principle in professing democrats, he was never left to wander in the mazes and perplexities of cold and cheerless skepticism. Democrats might be changeable, but democracy never. If he favored a sovereign by language more eulogistic than others could

¹ *The Freeholder*, pp. 78, 288.

² *Ibid*, pp. 71-72.

approve, it was because he saw in that sovereign the means of more good, and of a surer safety to the nation,—than he could discover either in the Pretender, or in the wisdom and professions of his followers. His integrity, his extensive acquirements, his accurate discernment of men and manners, his uniform spirit of justice, his elegant scholarship, and his consistency as a thinker, all helped much to create a popular interest in government, and to develop and elucidate the high mission of party. He uttered truths which will illumine and beautify the democratic record of England forever. It was his misfortune to live in an age of immorality, corruption and comparative ignorance, but it was his great privilege to improve its character, and to restore its distorted features.¹ It was his lot to act with men who looked for duty only in success, but it became his higher office to teach them that success could only be found in duty. To him Democracy was Christianity in public affairs, and he taught no system of Christianity to the exclusion of Democracy. While he was alive to such teachings of duty,—he could not but see the nature and character of his political opponents. In his sketch of the Tory Party—the reader will recognize a most accurate likeness. It is so life-like, so true and expressive, that no outline will need to be changed, no shade retouched, no expression modified. The party is to be found in all nations, and all ages alike. It is to-day what it was when Moses was a law giver. and it will remain the same,—so long as humanity has its weaknesses, and human progress its necessities. It imposes upon democracy the necessity of action, and gives the needed shades to the beautiful and sublime pictures of truth. The great and noble men, who, during all time, have honored its ranks by their talents and genius, are to be classed as workers in the mysterious cause of progress, and as agents of that Providence which leads and never errs. If men are led to accomplish results which they do not intend; to act from questionable motives, and confer unexpected blessings; or, to plot wrong, and in their plotting, help to secure the right; it is a mission, which, if it does not command the thanks of men, is seen to be blessed by Him whose will has raised up Herods and Pharaohs,² but always to be overruled by His wisdom.

¹ A single fact cannot fairly illustrate the state of morals of any period—but the following is quite significant. As soon as the death of the queen was announced, the Duke of Ormond, Lord Mareshal, and Bishop Atterbury, all leading Tories and Jacobites, held a secret meeting, at which the bishop earnestly besought Lord Mareshal to go forth immediately, and publicly proclaim the Pretender in form. The Duke of Ormond, who was a more prudent and cau-

tious temper, desired first to confer on the subject with the council. In answer to this proposal the right reverend prelate exclaimed, in great excitement:—"Damn it, you know very well that things have not been concerted enough for that yet; and that we have not a moment to lose."—*Dr. Smucker*, p. 90, and *Memoirs of Court of England*, by J. H. Jesse, Vol. II, p. 153.

² Romans ix: 17.

The real strength of the Jacobite rebellion, in 1715, was not seen openly, and yet it secretly pervaded all classes of society, and hardly any locality was without its reasonable organization.¹ During the reign of Anne, the Tories were far from being Jacobites, though they secretly favored the cause of the Pretender. They well knew the power of the old cry, "The Church is in danger," but their confidence in management gave them confidence in the possession of power, however acquired. They could make a Protestant of a Papist, or they could control politically a Papist King, or they could create a King who would be utterly indifferent as to what church he favored provided it acknowledged the Tory rule as its life and foundation. No man better understood the shifts of party than Bolingbroke, and no man was more ready to avail himself of favorable changes—whether consistent or inconsistent. "A deist, he cared nothing for the Church of England," says Cooke, "save as a party engine, and a convenient theme for declamation. He laughed to scorn the claim of divine right put forward by the Stuarts, and he despised the dogma of non-resistance, as an attempt to eradicate by an apothegm, passions which the whole artificial fabric of society, has been constructed only to control."² When unwilling to be counted a Jacobite he did not hesitate to speak of the Pretender in terms of contempt.³ But when the Tory party assumed his cause as their own, and gave their party commands, he joined the Pretender, because "he looked on his party to be under oppression and to call for his assistance."⁴

The utter exclusion of the Tories from the councils of the nation; their forced connection with the Jacobites, and consequent participation in the ignominious defeats of armed rebellion; the severities and penalties of

¹ "The effervescing elements of rebellion," says Cooke, "which the defeat at Preston had forced back, at a moment when they were about to burst, were still struggling for a vent; not a county of England, scarcely a hamlet in Scotland, was without its local conspiracy. In this conjuncture the hopes of the conspirators were placed upon the dissolution which must take place at the end of the following session. England, dizzy with the clash of factions, and sickening at the spectacle of civil bloodshed, would then be called upon to elect the arbiter of her destiny. Such the new House of Commons it was allowed it must be. The avowed expectations of the Tories, the anxiety, and even terror of the Whigs, show that there was at least reason to fear that the electors would return a Tory major-

ity. Had this happened, the second session of the next parliament would have been opened by James III."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 41.

² *History of Party*, Vol. II, p. 34.

³ "The chevalier's religion is not founded on the love of virtue and the detestation of vice." * * * "The spring of his whole conduct is fear, fear of the horns of the devil and of the flames of hell." * * * "He has all the superstition of a capuchin; but I found in him no tincture of the religion of a prince." * * * "There is no resource in his understanding. Men of the best sense find it hard to overcome religious prejudices, which are of all the strongest; but he is a slave to the weakest."—*Letter to Windham*.

⁴ *Letter to Sir Wm. Windham*.

impeachment, and the degradations of impotent disloyalty; their hopes in the common pride and passions of the people associated with the glory of native princes, and their prejudices against the dominion of petty princes of foreign birth; the unpopularity of the new King, and the presumptuous bearing of his imported followers; the disaffection of timid and sympathetic Whigs, and the promising uncertainties of disappointed politicians,—too heavy to float, too light to sink, and yet not so contemptible as to be without the influence of wealth or the alliance of blood,—were circumstances and conditions well calculated to incense a desperate party to resort to any scheme for the recovery of power, and even to inspire delusive hopes of success. The confident tone and perseverance of the Tories in the avowed expectation that they would be able to return a majority in the new House of Commons, and the imminent danger of renewed civil war and bloodshed,—alarmed the Whigs and led them to believe that revolutionary evils could be met only by revolutionary remedies. Their supreme confidence in principles gave them an illusory confidence in party strategy, as if error could aid truth, folly wisdom, and weakness power. When the Septennial Bill was first proposed, the Whigs were shocked at its political enormities, and evidently ashamed to indorse its obvious absurdities. Their common instincts were truer than their judgment. The fact that they could not bring forward the measure in open parliament for discussion and candid deliberation, without a party caucus, clearly discovered the doubts of first impressions. It was not until they could meet together to impart their fears and doubts of strength—that they could be persuaded to adopt the fatal heresy that party necessity is paramount to constitutional duty. Party excitement is always unfavorable to duty, when questionable measures are proposed. When they require the aid of a conclave committal, there is *prima facie* evidence that their friends are counselled more by their doubts and fears, than by their honest convictions of duty. A caucus for party nominations of candidates for office, is a commendable mode of duty, a convenient method of action, a prudent conference, alike creditable to those who compose it, and just to parties who are to be affected by its doings. A party caucus to bind legislative action is to place party obligations above those of the legislator. The one is under the solemnity of an oath, the other not. It is equivalent to holding a league with man more sacred than the invocations to God. It is not to be assumed that the only remedy was in the Septennial Bill, or that, if it had failed that the Stuarts would have been replaced upon the throne. Such assumptions of prophetic argument generally afford conclusive evidence of conscious weakness. A Papist King, as such, could no more survive in England, than a Protestant Emperor in France. No party has the right to assume the guardianship of government, except upon the basis of principle, and so far as it is able to command the deliberate voice of the people.

The policy, however, pursued by George I., was one of self defence. He had no alternative but to doubt the sincerity of the Tories, who had so recently been in conspiracy against him. He could trust only those who had proved themselves to be his political friends. Although it was said by Lord Chesterfield that "England was too large for him," it may be added with equal truth that England was made larger by the principles of his party.

Political parties have their conventional rights, and the good of society demands that they should be fairly conceded. Partisans, as such, have their motives of action, and their theories of what is best for the government, and the people. With these they have their party responsibilities and they should be held strictly accountable. It is bound to be consistent with itself. A party in power, does injustice to the people, and to itself,—if it fails to choose representative men of its own faith to exercise the power which for a time it holds in trust. In no other way can its theories be tested. These views are too obvious to need special elucidation. But, in adopting them, the great error should be avoided of indiscriminate action from mere party motives. A party in power, for example, is in legitimate position to administer the government according to principles professed and avowed by its acknowledged leaders. The professions of a party before an election are designed to secure the favor and confidence of the people, by a system of relief from grievances, and by a policy of promised benefits. Though each is accused by the other of all error and mischief, all are professedly honest, all are professedly loyal. Thus far the standard of party is properly made known, and it should be consistently regarded by its friends, and justly stated by its friends. Whatever is necessary for the information of the people ; whatever is in harmony with its own declaration of principle ; whatever is calculated to commend its own exercise of power, or to perpetuate its dominant position,—whether by the influence of its individual members, by the force of its own views and opinions, by the influence of its constitutional measures of government ; or indeed, by every method of persuasion not inconsistent with obedience to law, or the spirit of loyalty to the government as it is,—all will admit to be within the compass of the duties of citizenship, and therefore allowable as emanating from legitimate considerations of party.

Questions merely of a party character, are understood to be such as pertain exclusively to party, and not to country ; such as assume the right to beg the question at issue by official action, and to impose laws to perpetuate party control ; such as presume upon the possession of power to enforce the wrong however dangerous may be the precedent. No emergency, however great, will justify such usurpations to perpetuate party power. If the constitution is not equal to self preservation, it should be amended, as it was made, by the voice of the people.

These views, however, will be better understood by reviewing some of the mistakes of the Whig party, during the reign of George I. It is a serious error to suppose that the democratic party is never wrong, though a permanent truth that it is more uniformly right than its Tory opponents.

Perhaps no measures better illustrate the wide departure from fundamental principles, than the Septennial Bill, and Peerage Bill, proposed and acted upon during this reign. The Tories had been familiar with such measures, and they were not inconsistent with their standard of principle. It was an arbitrary exercise of power in harmony only with dangerous precedents, and justified by no emergency not within the reach of ordinary remedies. For a time the Whigs and Tories changed sides.¹ The Tories affected to be alarmed when contemplating their own fallacies, and the Whigs doubted the efficacy of their own faith by foolishly assuming that a Tory power was superior to a democratic principle. Nothing could be more certain, that if any questions were to be referred to the people—these were of the class to be submitted. The frequency of elections, the continuance of delegated authority are peculiarly questions of popular interest. To deny the importance of the one would be to doubt the exercise of their elective franchise; to favor the other would be to alter what the people had already done themselves.²

It was with reluctance that William III. approved the Triennial Bill. As a measure to insure the legitimate benefits of the Revolution it might be justified.³ It was asserted, however, that it was deemed a necessity by the King as a condition of the current Supply Bill, a precedent as difficult to reject then as it has been since, though always fraught with danger.

The Septennial Bill was introduced in the House of Lords, by the Duke of Devonshire. The objects of the Bill were set forth in the preamble, and these were substantially repeated by the Duke.⁴ He spoke of "the inconveniences that attended the triennial elections of members of parliament; particularly, that they serve only to keep up party, and to raise and foment feuds and animosities in private families; that, besides, they occasion ruinous expenses, and give a handle to the cabals and intrigues of foreign princes: That, therefore, it was becoming of the wisdom of that august assembly, to apply a proper remedy to an evil which might be attended with the most dangerous consequences, especially in the present temper of the nation, for though the rebellion was happily suppressed, yet the spirit of it remained unconquered," &c. He was seconded by the Earl of Rockingham, and the bill was favored by the Duke of Argyle, the Earl of

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. vii, pp. 304, 305.

² Ibid, pp. 305, 306.

³ Ibid, pp. 30, 323, 325, 333, 347, 355.

⁴ After reciting the act, 6th, William and Mary, for making parliaments Triennial, the preamble of the bill proceeds thus:

Dorset, and Lord Townshend. The Duke of Buckingham, the Lord Trevor, the Earls of Nottingham and Aylesford, and several other Peers,—although unwilling to oppose the bill, deemed it unreasonable, and of too much importance to be urged without careful deliberation. It was opposed by the Earls of Abingdon and Poulet, Lord Ferrers, and others—of the Tory Party, and for reasons set forth in a protest against the bill. The discussion of the bill affords an amusing chapter of party inconsistencies.¹ “The Whigs,” says Cooke, “became suddenly awake to the great inconvenience of popular tumults; the debaucheries occasioned by elections, and the corruption of the morals and principles of the people. They sighed over the animosities which these frequent contests created throughout the country, and declaimed at the exorbitance of their expense as ruinous to the candidates. They appropriated for the occasion all the common-places of Toryism, and paraded inconveniences which are as powerful to prove that parliaments should endure twenty years as that they should last for seven. The Tories, on the other hand, seized the artillery of their opponents. The Whigs would not avow that they proposed this measure because they were unpopular, but the Tories dared not avow that their ground of opposition was their hope of bringing in the Pretender. They, therefore, harangued on the topics of liberty, and discovered a sudden panic at the power of the crown, and a vehement affection for the rights of the people. They became assertors of the privileges of the House of Commons, and suddenly stood forth as the champions of those principles which it had long been the business of the party to persecute and deride.”²

Some of the Peers were at a loss what to say, or how to vote, though resolved not to embarrass the ministers. The Duke of Buckingham declared, “That he would not be against this Bill, if he thought it for the King’s

“And whereas, it hath been found by experience, that the said clause hath proved very grievous and burthensome, by occasioning much greater and more continued expenses, in order to elections of members to serve in parliament, and more violent and lasting heats and animosities among the subjects of this realm, than were ever known before the said clause was enacted; and the said provision, if it should continue, may probably at this juncture, when a restless and Papish faction are designing and endeavoring to renew the rebellion within this kingdom, and an invasion from abroad, be destructive to the peace and security of the government: Be it enacted, etc.”

Tindall says, “The rebellion was now

quelled, and the strength of the rebels entirely broken, but the disaffection of the people was not yet conquered. The parliament being only of three years continuance, all the hopes of the other party seemed to be centred in this, that the parliament would expire, and they should be able to return a party majority at the next election.” To prevent this the Septennial Bill was proposed. It not only lengthened the duration of future parliaments, but the members who had been elected only for three years, prolonged, of their own authority, the term of their continuance for four years more.—*Coze’s Walpole. Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 295.*

¹ *Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, pp. 296, 297, 300.*

² Moyle to Horace Walpole.

interest and service; but he was afraid the crown would be the worse for it." His objections were stated with much force, and yet he voted for the bill. The Earl of Dorset said, "That they who now spoke against this bill, would be for it, if it served their turn, etc." Nothing, probably, was more true, and yet, as a reason for it nothing could be more absurd from a Whig. The Duke of Kingston urged—"That the business of the legislature was to rectify old laws, as well as to make new ones." This is true, but when the people have acted according to the provisions of an old law, the legislature has no authority to alter what the people have done under it. It was doubtless competent for parliament to pass the Septennial Bill, to take effect at the period of a new election, already determined by the triennial law, but not at the expense of disfranchising the people.¹ The Earl of Aylesford uttered a comprehensive truth when he said, "This bill will establish a grievance, and take away a remedy." The bill was carried in the lords by a majority of thirty-five.²

When sent to the Commons, the Lord Guernsey moved to reject the bill without a reading. It was held, "That it was an imposition of the Lords to take upon them to direct the Commons in a matter, which solely concerns them, as guardians of the rights and liberties of the people." This view was seconded by Shippen, who said, "I shall apprehend it inconsistent with our honor to receive it." But this factious opposition was met by the Lord Coningsby, who remarked, "That their objection was altogether groundless, and the result of their want, either of experience or memory; for, had they like himself, been members of that house, when the triennial act was made, they might have remembered, that the same was begun in the House of Lords, who as a part of the legislature, are no less guardians of the liberty of the subject, than the Commons themselves." Such an objection from a Tory could have had but little force, inasmuch as the action of the Lords was doubtless to relieve the Commons from the charge of introducing a measure designed to increase their own power and to lessen that of the people. It was a shrewd party expedient.

The bill was extensively discussed in the Commons, by both parties, eliciting fresh absurdities, but no new views or motives.³ The ablest speech made against the bill was by William Shippen, a bold and undis-

¹ The Tories thought the most witty observation was that made on their side by the Earl of Peterborough, who was a Tory because Marlborough was a Whig. This leading member of a party which claimed to be the champion of our Protestant Church, said that, "if the present parliament continued beyond the time for which they were chosen, he knew not how to express the manner of their existence, unless, begging

leave of that venerable bench (he continued, turning to the bishops) they had recourse to the distinction used in the Athanasian Creed, for they would be neither created nor made, but proceeding."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 46.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 305.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 308.

⁴ Ibid, p. 310.

guised Tory.¹ He had no love nor compliment for the ministry. "It is no concern of ours," said he, "whether they have rendered themselves odious to the people or not. They are more properly the object of our jealousy than our care. They may be destroyed and the government subsist." He justly regarded such legislation as "paving the way to a despotic and military government, the greatest calamity that can befall a free-born people." His speech is so replete with sound philosophy, and as it is not often that an honest Tory speaks the truth for party purposes, it is commended to the reader as worthy of his particular attention.² But, as Shippen temporarily became an advocate of democracy to oppose the democrats, it may be interesting to see how Sir Richard Steele favored Toryism against the Tories.³ After repeating arguments which had already been urged by others, he said,—"It is objected, 'That the alteration proposed is a breach of trust:' The trust, Sir, reposed in us, is that of the public good: the King, Lords and Commons, are the parties who exercise this trust; and when the King, Lords and Commons exercise this trust by the measure of the common good, they discharge themselves, as well in the altering and repealing as in the making or confirming laws. The period of time, in this case, is a subordinate consideration; and those gentlemen who are against the alteration, speak in too pompous a style, when they tell us, 'we are breaking into the constitution.'"

It is not a little remarkable that Sir Richard should repeat the same error which was committed by his opponents when they impeached him. "The public good," under a constitutional government is "a trust" under specified instructions. When the public good is defined by law, any attempt to give a different construction is usurpation. *Ubi jus incertum, ibi jus nullum*. Where the law is uncertain, there is no law,—is an old Law maxim. His remark that the period of time 'is a subordinate consideration,' was singularly unfortunate. It was the principal fact of the case. Had his opponents moved his impeachment on the ground that the times were altered after his election, and therefore, the public good demanded his rejection,—it would have been quite as reasonable as the Septennial Bill. If Parliament could assume to act for the people in doubling the time they had granted,—on the same principle they could deny it entirely. Indeed,

¹ Of Shippen, Pope says;

"I love to pour out all myself, as plain
As downright Shippen, or as old Montaigne."

Sir Robert Walpole said of him: "That he would not say who was corrupted, but he would say who was not corruptible; that man was Shippen."—*Coxe's Walpole*.

² See Parl. Deb., Vol. vii, p. 312.

³ These debates form an era in the history of the national parties, since they afford the first instance of the Tories assuming, for a temporary purpose, the advocacy of popular rights. Since that time the expedient has been so commonly practised, that it is now an ordinary and well-understood branch of

it would be safer to deny official position, altogether, to one who had been elected by the people, than to him who assumed to act for them during a period not authorized by their special vote. Besides, if the Commons could rightfully enlarge the powers which alone belong to the people to define and limit, it would be competent for the people to lessen, or revoke authority already delegated by them. Such a precedent cannot be defended. Nothing can be more obvious than the principle of delegated authority. It is nothing but what it is made, and it acquires nothing by time.¹ An editor of Blackstone's Commentaries, says, "It never can be supposed that the next, or any succeeding parliament, had not the power of repealing the triennial act."² Of course, the law could be repealed, but it was quite a different thing to modify the vote of the people under the law. All legislative trusts, to be consistent, are self limited as to time and principle. By the constitution as to principle, and specific terms as to time. The principle is clearly stated by Locke, in his Treatise on Government. "The power of the legislative," says he, "being derived from the people by a positive voluntary grant and institution, can be no other than what that positive grant conveyed; which being only to make laws and not legislators, the legislative can have no power of transferring their authority of making laws, and placing it in other hands."

The Whigs seemed to forget that their former glory and strength consisted in their loyalty, and in their uniform devotion to the British Constitution. They saw imaginary dangers in their opponents, and an infallible power in themselves to meet them. This was usurpation. They were willing to risk the permanent evil of a dangerous precedent, to accomplish an uncertain temporary good. They believed in democracy to administer the government, but not to save their party. The Septennial Bill passed the Commons by a majority of two hundred and sixty-four against one hundred and twenty-one.³

party strategy; but we should not forget to render to Shippen and Wyndham the honor of its invention. The conduct of these able leaders appears to have been prompted by a profound knowledge of the resources of their party. Toryism was formed for government; IT IS ONLY A CREED FOR RULERS. — *Hist. of Party*, VOL. II, p. 49.

¹ Sir Robert Raymond, member of the House of Commons, said, "With great submission I speak it, in my poor opinion, King, Lords, and Commons can no more continue a parliament beyond its natural duration, than they can make a parliament.

I know at extraordinary junctures, conventions have been turned into parliaments; but it has been thought advisable soon to determine them, and to pass acts in the subsequent legal parliaments, to confirm what they have done." * * * "By this bill, you have all the mischief of a long parliament, without any of the good of a short one."—*Parl. Deb.* VOL. VII, p. 339. Sir Robert was Solicitor General to Queen Anne, and Attorney General to George the First.

² *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. VII, p. 294.

³ *Parl. Deb.*, VOL. VII, p. 379.

The Commons had been made sufficiently permanent by the Septennial Bill, and it now remained to reconstruct the House of Lords. The King was persuaded to believe that his position as a Whig was of more consequence to the nation than the constitutional prerogatives of the crown. He did not hesitate to declare in a Message to the House of Lords his readiness to coöperate in "the settling of the Peerage of the whole Kingdom, upon such a foundation, as may secure the freedom and constitution of parliament in all future ages."¹ It is interesting to observe, with what confidence he is made to speak of a mere party movement of to-day,—which is to last forever. He was led to speak first to prepare the public mind for the measure. It was apparently against the prerogatives of the crown, and his approval in advance was designed to obviate such an objection, as it was certain to be made. The Tories, in the reign of Queen Anne did not hesitate to create Peers for party purposes. They were severely condemned by the Whigs. But now, the Whigs professed to see no good reason why such a precedent should not be followed by a party claiming always to be honest when in power, if not always honest in acquiring the means of power.

It was not unlikely that the bitter disaffection between the King and the Prince of Wales, was regarded as favorable to the future strength of the Tory party. Here may be seen an unavoidable evil in hereditary monarchy. The King expressed without qualification or concealment an unnatural aversion to his son. The Tories saw too much advantage in such an alienation not to increase and perpetuate it on every available occasion.² The heir to the crown, unfortunately, becomes the special object of party attention, when party spirit prevails. A weak, or ambitious prince or princess, entitled to the crown, is not often equal to the many temptations which promise distinction, or the means of pleasurable indulgence. The atmosphere of the court is not favorable to parental affection, or parental authority. The royal infant becomes the child of state. Its birth and education are surrounded by heartless formalities ill suited either to quicken or continue a father's joy, or a mother's love. It is left to smile on a servile nurse, and to be caressed by obsequious strangers. Its childhood is severed from the maternal bosom as the budding flower is when cut from its natural stem. Instead of blooming in the sunny light of a mother's tender affection, it is doomed to the cold shade of mere preceptorial instruction. Often without the benefit of a father's good example, or the encouraging kindness of maternal love,—the child rises from youth to manhood with an imposing parade of culture, but without a practical knowledge of virtue, or of religion. It is petted with the follies of fashion,

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 590.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 607.

misled and flattered by a pampered nobility, and taught by cunning politicians to turn filial reverence into partisan hate. Where, then, is the wonder that such a being should be incapable of honoring his father and mother, or that parents should forget, or discard their offspring! It was said by apologists, always ready with an inventive genius to defend the weaknesses of royalty, that the King's dislike to the prince, was because of his doubtful paternity. There is no evidence to warrant such a speculation, and the King is not entitled to its benefit in history.¹

The ostensible motives for the Peerage Bill were stated by the Duke of Somerset when he presented it. "The number of peers being of late years," said he, "very much increased since the union of the two kingdoms, it seemed absolutely necessary to fix the same, both to preserve the dignity of peerage, and to prevent the inconveniences that may attend the creation of a great number of peers to serve a present purpose, of which they had a remarkable instance in the late reign." It was certainly a singular mode of preserving "the dignity of peerage," by limiting the sources of its future growth to the ordinary chances of birth. Party is never bashful in the choice of imposing language, and the more doubtful the occasion, the greater the necessity of pretence. To denominate the act of Anne as a mere inconvenience, was as charitable as the claim to dignity was pretentious.

The Bill was discussed with much feeling, and not a little embarrassment. It was defended by the Whigs with evident reluctance and doubt. The King permitted his influence to be used without disguise, and with a show of such ample historical fairness, that it was hoped that the Whigs would generally unite in supporting it.² But they divided,—and its consideration, though pressed with inconsiderate haste by the Earl of Sunderland and others, was postponed from time to time to insure consolidated party action. The changes in the Peerage, from the reign of Queen Elizabeth were reviewed,³ and it was insisted with much vigor and apparent sincerity, that there was no safety but in its limitation, and that its limitation did not trench upon the prerogatives of the crown. The Earls of Oxford and Cowper,—did not hesitate to expose "the secret meaning of the motion," and the inconsistency of the special friends of the King—who were willing to serve him by taking away his constitutional power, and by subordinating both him and the Peerage to party control. Of course, party motives were

¹ Dr. Smucker says,—“After the return of George I. from Hanover the open quarrel occurred between him and the Prince of Wales, which continued during the remainder of the life of the monarch, and became disgracefully notorious. The origin of the

dispute is said by some writers to have been jealousy of the popularity gained by the Prince during the exercise of his regency. —*Hist. of the Four Georges*, p. 44.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, p. 610.

³ *Ibid*, p. 593.

disclaimed, with extravagant protestations of duty,¹ as they always are in such cases of outrage upon principle. But few were deceived, though the bill was passed in the House of Lords by a considerable majority, and sent to the Commons. The Whig majority of the Lords, however, did not satisfy the Whig majority of the nation. The measure was unpopular with the people, and generally condemned.

The party embarrassments of the Commons were soon overcome by the spirit of democratic decency. The Whigs were restored to a sense of danger, and were led to see that there were no means of averting it but by bold and independent action. Democracy was self-confident, and disclaimed the expedients of artifice. The skilful pen of Addison was employed to defend the measure, and Steele became his opponent.² This controversy, between Addison and Steele, was of great vehemence, and it was deeply lamented by Dr. Johnson. They had long been friends, and were members of the same party. Sir Robert Walpole, also, published a pamphlet, and made a powerful speech upon the subject. Though no man was better versed in democratic principles than Addison,—yet, the zealous impetuosity of Sunderland, and the bribes, promises and threats of ministers, and the assurance that it was in accordance with the wishes of his majesty,—that it should become a law,—his amiableness was overcome, and he was induced to cease for a time to be a statesman, and to act the part of a lawyer. It is possible that Steele was influenced by similar considerations,—but led by other men of equal distinction in an opposite direction, and by personal convictions of duty to his favorite party and to his country. His objections to the bill were set forth in a speech of much ability, truly refreshing to the reader, after seeing his departure from democracy in his language on

¹ During the interval between the prorogation and meeting of parliament the minister exerted every effort to engage a majority in its favor. Bribes were profusely lavished, promises and threats were alternately employed, in every shape which his sanguine and overbearing temper could suggest. He affected to declare, that it was the King's desire, and not the act of the ministry; he did not attempt to conceal that it was levelled against the future government of the Prince of Wales, whom he represented as capable of doing mad things when he came to the throne. He declared that the necessary consequence of its rejection would be the ruin of the Whigs, and the introduction of the Tories into the confidence and favor of the King; expressed his surprise

that any person who styled himself a Whig should oppose it; and exerted himself in the business with so much heat and violence, that in endeavoring to persuade Middleton, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who refused to support the measure in the British House of Commons, the blood gushed from his nose."—*Coxe's Walpole*.

² Coxe says,—“In vain the pen of Addison had been employed in defending the Bill, in a paper called, ‘The Old Whig,’ against Steele, who attacked it in a pamphlet entitled ‘The Plebeian;’ and whose arguments had greater weight with the public.”—*Coxe's Walpole*. See *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VII, pp. 607, 608, 609, 610.

the Septennial Bill. "I am against the Bill," said he, "because I fear it will change this free state into the worst of all tyrannies, that of an aristocracy." He pointed out the want of harmony between the preamble of the bill, and the provisions of the bill itself, and demonstrated that it would be an act of arbitrary power, in violation of the act of Union with Scotland.¹ He ridiculed the idea that it was favored by the King, and expressed his fears, a conclusion all true men would be likely to accept,—**"THAT WHAT IS FOUNDED ON USURPATION, WILL BE EXERTED IN TYRANNY."**

But the great speech on this occasion was that of Walpole. To his influence, in and out of parliament, more than any other, must be attributed the rejection of the bill in the House of Commons. It was rejected by a majority of ninety-two.²

To form a just estimate of the numerous changes, and modifications of political parties, in the reign of George I., it is necessary to understand the peculiar characteristics of that age in respect to all things. It was a speculative age. As much so, perhaps, as any recorded in history. It was an age of doubt and insincerity. It was an age of credulity in all that was impossible, and of incredulity in all that was true and fundamental. There was unbounded confidence in the extremes of things, not upon any known principle, but in utter contempt of all knowledge of fallacies. Money became invested with a fabulous power of self-production, and instead of contributing to the wants of industry, became its master and enemy. Men and women, the laboring poor and the wealthy; the peer and the commoner; royalty,³ and the nobility,—alike became infatuated with the wonderful virtue of corporate schemes, and the omnipotent power of money. The only mode of doing business, was to abandon old methods, and with wild fanaticism to compete for new ones. This was the period of the "South Sea Bubble," in which the government, and political parties became extensively involved. As it embraced the munificent feature of paying off the government debt, and at the same time promised untold wealth to shareholders, most men of prominence, whether public or retired, the statesman and the politician,—either became connected with the great scheme itself, or with one or more of its extensive progeny. The whole nation participa-

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. VII, pp. 612, 614, 615.

² Cooke says, "There can be little doubt that, had the Peerage Bill succeeded, the popular indignation would ere long have swept away the House of Lords. The honor of defeating this short-sighted measure is due to Walpole, although, from his recent conduct, we may be allowed to doubt whether his motives were as patriotic as his acts. It was he alone who prevailed

upon the Whigs in opposition to exert themselves against a measure which came artfully recommended as a pledge of salvation to their party."—*Hist. Party*, Vol. II, p. 87.

³ The Prince of Wales was governor of the Welsh Copper Company. The speaker and Mr. Walpole did their utmost to dissuade him, but to no purpose.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VII, p. 654.

ted in the strange infatuation, and the government itself became a party to the delusion, and was ultimately involved in the mortifying results and general despair of the people. To convey to the reader an adequate idea of the wild schemes of this period would require a volume.¹ Politicians were so generally interested in the prevailing bubbles that they saw but little opportunity to become party informers against their opponents. Most were sharers in the numerous impositions, and had special motives for concealment. There were some few exceptions, but not enough to form a party, even if they were united on other issues before the government. Parliament pursued a course of nominal independence, and ordered with grave formality severe investigations. It was made a penal offence for any person or persons, even to petition for an act of incorporation for any purpose whatever.² The members could do no less,—though most of them were probably at a loss as to what means they had to restore ruined fortunes, to hide the villainies of knowing rogues, or the follies of their suffering victims. So confident were the active agents of the South Sea scheme, that the government itself, directly or indirectly, was induced to become an interested party in its doings. They were so bold at first, that they were disposed to defy all parliamentary committees, and to defend themselves against all complaints of contempt, by the use of their special knowledge of prominent participators in the great imposition.

With such an atmosphere of doubt and reckless activity, it was impossible that any political party could study any particular standard of principle, with much hope of successful duty. The Whig party, though largely in the ascendent, lost sight of its great source of strength in democracy. It separated into jealous and hostile factions, and placed confidence in men and management, as above principle and duty. The Tory party began to realize that it could no longer quote its maxims of "divine right," and

¹ Sir John Blunt, formerly a scrivener, was one of the projectors of the South Sea Company, and one of the chief managers. He was called before a committee of parliament, and a resolution of censure reported and passed. He is noticed by Pope :

"Much injured Blunt! why bears he Britain's hate?
A wizard told him in these words our fate:
'At length Corruption, like a gen'ral flood
'(So long by watchful ministers withstood)
'Shall deluge all: and Avarice creeping on,
'Spread like a low-born mist, and blot the sun;
'Statesman, and Patriot, ply alike the stocks,
'Peereas and Butler share alike the box,
'And Judges job, and Bishops bite the town,
'And mighty Dukes pack cards for half a crown.
'See Britain sunk in lucre's sordid charms,
'And France reveng'd on Anne's and Edward's arms."

"'Twas no court-badge, great scriv'ner! fir'd thy brain,
Nor lordly luxury, nor city gain:
No, 'twas thy righteous end, asham'd to see
Senates degenerate, patriots disagree,
And nobly wishing party-rage to cease,
To buy both sides, and give thy country peace."
—*Parl. Deb.* VOL. VII, p. 702.

² The King published a Proclamation declaring all these unlawful projects should be deemed common nuisances, and prosecuted as such; with the penalty of £500 for any broker to buy or sell any shares in them. They were stopped, but not until after business had been prostrated and many ruined.—*Parl. Deb.* VOL. VII, p. 654. We have placed a List of the Bubbles, in the Appendix. See APPENDIX G.

"non-resistance," with any hopes of renewed influence, and that the Jacobites had ceased to inspire confidence either in their cause; or in their promises.

It would be interesting to note the various changes and their causes, in the cabinet, after the resignation of Sunderland, but they are too much of a personal nature to afford much instruction to the reader. Sunderland was an ambitious man. Though very unpopular, he retired with reluctance. When he failed to neutralize the partiality of the King for Walpole, he did not cease his intrigues for favor and position.¹ He exerted his influence to remove the ministers of the cabinet just formed by Walpole, and to irritate the King against his son, the Prince of Wales. He had his influential friends, and in his disappointments was not averse to a coalition with the Tories. He was toasted and complimented by them, and it was asserted that he even favored the cause of the Pretender. Before his intrigues were matured, however, he was removed by the hand of death, and he was not permitted to see the utter failure of all his hopes and plans. The Tories were elated by the slightest encouragement, and their hopes were chiefly centred in the promises of their former enemies. They were even cheered by a proposed foreign league against England, formed by the cabinets of Vienna, Madrid and Russia, but this hope was crushed by the Whigs who met the threatened danger by an alliance with France and Prussia.²

Bolingbroke returned from his banishment, but as he had been denounced by the Jacobites as their bitter enemy,—it became his early purpose to reorganize the Tory party, excluding the chief elements of its former faith. He announced its death and burial, and sought the aid of leading Whigs, who were out of power, to organize a new party in opposition to the Walpole administration. He pursued the usual plan, adopted by disappointed politicians, by denouncing all party names and distinctions, and called upon all lovers of freedom and justice, to unite upon a patriotic basis for the good of the country irrespective of party. He gained a powerful ally in Pulteney, whose personal resentments against Walpole were yet to be relieved. A new paper was established to promulgate the principles of the new party, on the obsolete basis of no-party.³ As the language of this paper not only represents its authors, but may with great propriety make a part of this chapter, a brief extract is inserted: "As everybody knows that, for near a century past, this kingdom hath been continually agitated with

¹ To remove Walpole from Parliament, Sunderland proposed to the King to create him postmaster-general for life. But on being told that he had not asked for the appointment, the King said, "Do not, then, make him the offer, I parted with him

once against my inclination, and I will never part with him again as long as he is willing to serve me."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p 96.

² Coxe's *Walpole and Correspondence*.

³ *The Craftsman*.

contentions; occasioned by mutual jealousies and uneasiness between the prince and the people, for liberty on the one side and the prerogative on the other; in which also religion has not been a little concerned. These disputes, which have divided the nation into two great factions, and brought about several wonderful revolutions in our government, seem at present to be, in a great measure, terminated by the firm establishment of the Protestant succession against all attempts to defeat it, and by the general affection of the people to his majesty's person, family and government.

"Notwithstanding this, the names of distinction are still kept up, when our differences are so generally reconciled; and we preserve the same bitterness, hatred, and animosity against each other, whilst we are in the *same interest* and pursue the *same end* as when we professed contrary views and took measures diametrically opposite.

"If you ask a Whig for his opinion of a Tory, he'll tell you, in general, that he is a Jacobite or a Papist; a friend to arbitrary government, and against the liberties of the people, both in church and state.

"Take the character of a Whig, in like manner, from a Tory, and you will hear him described to be a man of republican principles; a Presbyterian, and a sworn enemy to the church of England and the regal prerogative; nay, it will be well for him if he is not set forth as a downright atheist or libertine, and an enemy to all government whatever."¹

Bolingbroke used similar language in his political writings, always disguising Tory schemes with avowed sentiments of democracy. It was even believed by some, that had Walpole, or Sunderland encouraged him as a leader in the Whig party, though it was well known that they opposed his pardon and return, that he would have openly declared himself a democrat. He complained bitterly that he received more damage from his friends than his enemies. An enemy is not trusted, and there is always a ready defence against his attack, but a treacherous friend is sometimes proved most dangerous when most trusted. Such a belief, however, was not consistent with an accurate estimate of ambitious men. It is true, if it may be supposed that Walpole could have yielded, Bolingbroke might have done the same. One was as possible as the other. Ambitious men of power are often easily reconciled with opponents of inferior capacity, but they are not easily induced to favor rivals. They seldom make agreements but to master, and they generally retire to secure a new position, if they do not succeed. Bolingbroke afforded an interesting illustration of this truth by employing women to accomplish his ends. By the influence of his wife and the Duchess of Kendall² he was permitted to return from his banishment.

¹ Craftsman, No. 40.

Frederic Achatins, Count of Schulenburg

² The Duchess of Kendall was sister of and Hedlen. Petronelle Melesina, Count-

By their influence he made systematic efforts to induce the King to make him chief minister, and to remove Walpole and Townshend. He was persistent and artful in his movements. The Duchess of Kendall served him with as much faithfulness as any one could, who had no choice but to serve two parties at the same time,—representing rival aspirations, and opposing interests. The social intimacy existing between Walpole and the King was not favorable to such intrigues. They were opposed and condemned by the King, and well known to Walpole. Bolingbroke was not easily discouraged. Conscious of his own great and persuasive powers, he sought an interview with the King as the only direct means of success. After much difficulty, but not without the aid of Walpole himself, he secured a hearing. The result was mortifying to Bolingbroke, and amusing both to the King and Walpole. It gave strength to the ministers, and enabled Bolingbroke to see that he could indulge in no hope of advancement except in the formation of a new party. This too, was difficult and unpromising when he saw that there was no chance for success save by the aid of democratic statesmanship, and the coöperation with old political opponents. In this period, as in all times, is to be found “auxiliary Whigs,” and “auxiliary Tories,” party men by name but not in principle—ready to participate in any coalition that promised control or advantage. Such men acquire but little party strength. They talk much, but seldom act. They are often respectable, even distinguished, but they are too timid to be useful, too neutral to be honest.

Who could better lament the bitter fruits of party than a disappointed party-man, who aspired to the highest, and yet had not reached the lowest position. It is the language of Bolingbroke :

“There is no complaint which hath been more constantly in the mouths, no grief hath lain more heavily at the hearts of all good men, than those about our national divisions ; about the spirit of party, which inspires animosity and breeds rancour ; which hath so often destroyed our inward peace, weakened our national strength, and sullied our glory abroad. It is time, therefore, that all who desire to be esteemed good men, and to procure the peace, the strength, and the glory of their country by the only means by which they can be procured effectually, should join their efforts to heal our national divisions, and to change the narrow spirit of party into a diffusive spirit of public benevolence.”

ess of Walsingham, who afterwards married the Earl of Chesterfield, was supposed to be her daughter, by George I., though she was considered as her niece. The Duchess was without a rival in the confidence of the King, on the death of Lady

Darlington, and in consideration of £11,000, she assured Lord Bolingbroke that she would obtain his complete restoration. She returned to England, and died in 1743, at a very advanced age.—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. viii, pp. 569, 573.

To those who would oppose this union, he exclaims : " Wicked and unhappy men ! who seek their private safety in opposing public good. Weak and silly men ! who vainly imagine that they shall pass for the nation, and the nation for a faction ; that they shall be judged in the right, and the whole body of the people in the wrong ! How long do they imagine that so unequal a contest can last ? " ¹

It is more than a century and a half since the utterance of this democratic language by a Tory. He appeals to all parties to become democratic in principle, and yet, to " the narrow spirit of party," of which he complains, the world is indebted for that " diffusive spirit of public benevolence," for which he so earnestly prays. The " unequal contest " is still continued and will be, forever. Unequal only for a day, for the steady triumphs of democracy demonstrate the inevitable progress of its principles, and that, without them, no nation can acquire permanent life and strength, the indispensable conditions upon which " the public good " depends.

But what are the teachings of the reign of George I. ? In some respects his reign was marked by singular party absurdities. Party infatuation prevailed, but without consistency. It was not even decent. Democracy was triumphant in influence, but not in unity. The Tories lost all power, but they did not surrender to the Whigs. Parties were divided into factions. The Whigs administered the government, but they were not true to democracy. Corruption was denounced by all, and all were guilty of it. With any hope of success, it was considered the only method of attack, and it was deemed the cheapest method of defence. If corruption had not succeeded in returning a majority of Whigs to the Commons, Walpole was ready to extend the septennial period of parliament. The Church was neither true to itself, nor true to party. Bishop Atterbury was the acknowledged leader of the Jacobites, but he was not a Jacobite himself. He was a Protestant, and yet he favored a Catholic King. Bolingbroke ceased to be a Tory, and became a political philanthropist. He imagined that he could form the strongest party by being true to no party. The government claimed to be democratic but it was so blinded by the possession of power, that it did not hesitate to adopt a Tory heresy to meet a Tory danger. The guilt of Atterbury was not legally proved, but he was banished by moral evidence, by " the higher law." Tory activity only added to Whig influence, and yet the people were without the full benefit of democracy. The facetious remark of Walpole, " that he governed the King by means of bad Latin," was not without its special truth and significance. The Whigs were too strong to be mastered, but too ignorant to be honest. Their success was in the professions of democracy, and their failure in the practice of its principles. Whigs would not desert democracy, but they were willing

¹ Dissertation on Parties, Letter I.

to join the Tories. Private motives were paramount to public good. Monarchy claimed a triumph, but its special friends saw the fruits of victory only in the hands of an aristocracy. Even the great Bolingbroke doubted himself, and trusted the women. He labored only by anonymous communications, and for a motley party. Rivals and opponents were sleeplessly vigilant in watching each other in constant fear and expectation of trick and intrigue,—and yet it was left to the Duke of Orleans, of France, to disclose a plot, which, if carried out, would have involved not only the safety of England, but the peace of Europe. Party struggles were incessant, but they were the struggles of factions under a common name. Public topics became involved with private motives and personal resentments. Every faction had its leader. Every leader had his scheme, but no scheme could stand alone. The King depended on his minister, and his minister on the possession of power, or the means of corruption. The commons depended on the voice of the people, and the people on the vote of parliament. The Church restlessly leaned upon the government, but all rested upon the influence only to be found in the mighty name of Democracy. Even the partial application of democratic principles advanced and secured the peace of the nation, and, in a general way, protected the industry, rights and interests of the people.

When George I. died, he was in his carriage on his way to Germany, and almost as ignorant, perhaps, of the policy which saved the crown to the House of Hanover, as he was of the people of England when he ascended the throne.¹ A nominal democracy was found to be superior to a real monarchy. The inquiry still remains to be answered,—In what consists the intrinsic elements of royalty, and where are the sources of its strength and power? They are not to be found in the reign of George I., and it remains to be seen what truths are developed in the events of the reign of George II.

GEORGE THE SECOND.

The events which marked the accession of George the second to the British throne, and the peculiar combinations of men, and of mind—which distinguished his long reign, are worthy of particular consideration. Not so much on account of any preponderating influence of great men, or of any masterly system of policy pursued during the changes of an entire

¹ The King departed for Hanover June 3d, 1727, and died on Sunday, June 11th, in the 68th year of his age and 13th of his reign. It is said, however, that the exact time and place cannot be ascertained; but it is most probable, that he expired either as the carriage was ascending the hill near Ippenburen, or on the summit. On their arrival at the palace of his brother, the Bishop of Osnaburg, he was immediately bled, but all attempts to recover him proved ineffectual.—*Parl. Deb.*, VOL. VIII, p. 572.

generation, as in the conflicts of antagonistic elements which rather neutralized than mastered each other. The nominal power of royalty—aided by adventitious circumstances, and an indifferent democratic faith,—proved to be superior to the highest statesmanship of Toryism.

There is certainly nothing in the history of hereditary monarchy that should either flatter the pride of royalty, or discourage the hopes of democracy. Experience from the earliest periods utters the same teachings, and illustrates by constantly recurring examples—the folly and weakness of man, the unerring wisdom of God.

Gideon of Manasseh, the chosen deliverer of Israel, was not taken from an untainted family. Joash, his father, had erected an altar to Baal, at Ophrah, and Gideon was commanded by the Lord to destroy it. Though the sword of Jehovah and of Gideon was more than equal to the complete overthrow of the powerful Midianites, still, it was not turned to protect the numerous family of Gideon, or to perpetuate his blood. His divine commission was followed by his disgrace with Drumah. Abimelech, her illegitimate son, “a bold, bad man,” was permitted to destroy his father’s numerous progeny, regarded as his lawful issue, and to influence the people of Shechem to anoint himself as their King. It is true, Jotham escaped, but not to avenge the death of his brethren. This was left to be done in an ignoble way by a common woman whose name is not recorded. She broke the skull of Abimelech by throwing a large stone from the battlements of a tower upon his head. The means employed for these great results, in themselves, were insignificant and apparently contemptible. Such results cannot be traced to merit, nor can such agents be congratulated upon enviable distinction. Jotham was a wise man, and understood his times. The earliest parable of history was uttered by him, and as a lesson of wisdom it cannot be too often repeated.

When Jotham was told that the men of Shechem had made Abimelech King, “he went and stood in the top of the Mount of Gerizim, and lifted up his voice, and cried, and said unto them, Hearken unto me, ye men of Shechem, that God may hearken unto you :

“The trees went forth on a time to anoint a King over them ; and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive said unto them, Should I leave my fatness wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the fig-tree, Come thou, and reign over us. But the fig-tree said unto them, Should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me King over you, then come and put

your trust in my shadow : and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon." The reader will find the teachings of this significant parable in the context of the chapter where it is related.¹

The choice of the bramble to rule as the chief over the Trees, and the signal failure and disgrace of that rule, has many parallels in history. It is difficult to say how much the world is truly and directly indebted to wisdom for success, and how much it is deterred from wickedness and folly by opposite examples to be avoided. Since evil is permitted, and cannot be approved in itself, it becomes a sacred study of Providence,—that seeks to understand its meaning and uses. The exquisite satire of Jotham embodies the wisdom of ages, and it served as a bitter rebuke to an ungrateful people, whose want of understanding became an instructive example for all time. Modern philosophy is not above its teachings.

However true may be the couplet of Shakespeare, as applied to nature, that

"Gnats are unnoticed wheresoe'er they fly,
But eagles gazed upon by every eye,"

it cannot with equal truth be applied to humanity. Littleness may be forced into relations of greatness, and be made notorious by accident, birth, wealth, by the whims of a reckless power, or by the voice of a benighted or ignorant people. An atom may make the insignificant part of a mountain, but of itself, it is too small to be measured, unless combined with masses invested with inherent functions and forces. So with men, who have a position in society above their merits, and beyond their capacity to fill, or to honor. Ambition, unaccompanied by talent, and unexalted by virtue, sometimes acquires position by deception, and authority by usurpation. Royalty, by virtue of its legal investiture, is an innocent perpetuity of power, though it may be made the exponent of weakness and folly, or the instrument of guilt and oppression. These truths were seen and realized by Jotham as clearly as by the wisest men of to-day. The spiniferous nature of the bramble was not changed by being made King over the Trees, nor were the leading men of Shechem exempted from the strict accountability in their abuse of a sacred trust,—which demanded the faithful exercise of a discriminating judgment in the selection of a ruler.

By the varied and combined influences of church and state ; by the strategy of statesmanship, and the bloody instrumentalities of war ; by the accidents of life, the strifes of party, the struggles of interest and the conflicts of prejudice and passion,—George the Second was placed upon the throne as the lawful King of Great Britain. In other words, he became monarch by virtue of his birth. He was permitted by Providence to

¹ Judges, Chap. ix.

thought himself great; as King of Great Britain only rich. Avarice, the meanest of all passions, was his ruling one; and I never knew him deviate into any generous action." * * * "He well knew that he was governed by the Queen, while she lived; and that she was governed by Sir Robert Walpole: but he kept that secret inviolably, and flattered himself that nobody had discovered it."¹

He had taken no part in politics, nor had he sympathized with the changing cabals in opposition to the policy of his father's reign. He claimed to be a Whig, but his convictions of duty were rather the offspring of passion, or sentiment, than of judgment. He enjoyed one advantage that was not permitted to his father,—he had some knowledge of the English language. He boasted of another,—“That he had not one drop of blood in his veins which was not English.” He knew something of the constitution of England, but his knowledge was so limited that statesmanship was as much a mystery to him, as were the undiscovered wonders of steam. His professed devotion to England was merely of a verbal nature. It was an expedient of royal heartlessness of an inferior mind. He could possibly comprehend in some degree, the sources of his power, if he failed to understand the laws of its application. His heart was in Hanover, or in the keeping of his mistresses, and though frequently absent, he was seldom missed.²

What Coxe says of history, when speaking of the official acts of the King, is equally applicable to his domestic life as represented by different authors. “Some of the French writers,” says he, “call history *la fable convenue*, and not without some degree of reason: for most histories are written either by authors who have been themselves interested in the events which they relate, and gloss over the transactions of their own party, or are composed by writers who have not access to original papers, know little more than common occurrences, and derive their principal information from uncertain publications, traditional reports, gazettes and newspapers.”

It has often been said that no writer can give a truthful history of his own times. This is a great mistake. It would be safer to assert,—that no writer can give an accurate account of an age in which he was not a part, and a personal observer. He has only to be honest, and to speak the truth.

A weak or bad man in power, does not look for strength either in principle or wisdom. He relies upon luck or management. He has his

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 972.

² Thackeray says, — “He was always going back to Hanover. In the year 1729 he went for two whole years, during which Caroline reigned for him in England, and he was not in the least missed by his Brit-

ish subjects. He went again in '35 and '36; and between the years 1740 and 1755 was no less than eight times on the Continent.” — *The Four Georges*, p. 367.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. viii, p. 591.

suppliant tools, who are always ready to do his bidding, with motives to gain, or position. If weak, and in position by mere luck, he becomes the tool of designing men, and governs through them. If able, but dishonest,—he uses others as he has occasion, and to the extent of his power. Such men are often permitted to inflict evils upon society, not only by their acts, but by their language, which makes a part of history. Unworthy men are frequently flattered, and good men slandered. The people are sadly duped in their own generation in regard to the personal character of their public servants, and posterity insulted by false assertions and disgraceful comparisons in the records of history. The rule of bad men, however, is providentially short, and the rule of weak men is generally relieved by the common intelligence which prevails in society. Permanently, no man, or party—can rise above his or its natural level. As water finds its level, so goodness permeates moral existence.

The peculiar character of George II., may be seen in the events of his domestic life. Here the restraints and requisitions of royalty did not conceal or control his natural tendencies of mind. He acted himself, and without the special surveillance of Parliament, or the formalities imposed by ministers, who deem them indispensable in view of traditional decency or of constitutional duty. The King is a technical creation, an ideal power, a nominal head, surrounded by intelligent keepers. To judge accurately of his real importance he must be detached from government and viewed as a man. His capacity should be practically tested. He should be studied in his strength and wisdom, and in his weaknesses, follies, habits, tastes and tendencies. It need not be stated how difficult it is to ascertain the real character of a public functionary—who is the dispenser of favors whether of interest or of titles. A weak King may have able ministers, an ignorant President may have wise counsellors,—but it can hardly be supposed that such advisers would readily confess their principal to be either an imbecile or a *débauché*. Such an admission is revolting both to pride and to an honest judgment. The truth is suppressed respecting the deficiencies of public men that an outward decency may be observed. What a lamentable fact, and how humiliating! It is not even the duty of charity to conceal such defects of capacity, or of character, or to excuse them. If there be in human nature any such moral elements as integrity of purpose, true dignity of character, a religious sense of duty,—they certainly should be found in the patriotic statesman whose knowledge of law is public security. In no department of science, is ignorance counted a qualification either for inquiry, or active duty. On the contrary,—it is invariably deemed an insuperable objection, or an obstacle. It is blindness. It cannot see, it cannot think, it cannot act. The same is true of incapacity, whether it be found in a King, who inherits his position, or in a President who is exalted to office by the vote of inconsiderate partisans. In the one case, the theory

is degrading to humanity, inasmuch as it leaves to luck what wisdom assigns to judgment, and in the other it strangely seeks to derive strength from weakness, and success from failure.

There is no better illustration of these views to be found in history, than in the events which characterize the singular life of George II: Feeble in capacity, he was placed in council with the wisest,—to solve the difficult problems of government, and to discuss with the ablest statesmen the rights of nations.¹ Ignorant of the elements of political economy, he was supposed to be the arbiter of knowledge—capable of classifying the precedents of the past, and of their just application in practice. Vain and ambitious, he sought to achieve the highest results by the lowest means. When the welfare of the nation needed the greatest wisdom, he was sure to exhibit the weakest judgment. He strained for the ripest fruit, but seized the rottenest. The head of the Church, he became the exemplar of the greatest sins, and of the most unmitigated follies. The professed admirer of woman, but the ready instrument of her dishonor. In him beauty only inspired pollution. He was zealous in his loves, but faithless in his gallantries. He mistook lust for love, and beastly indulgence for affection. He was impatient when forbearance became a virtue, and incredulous when belief became a duty. Bland and courtly in his manners when gratified, but rough and uncouth when opposed. He was both awkward and indecent, and was just as likely to mingle his jests and sensual levities with his devotions and prayers,—as with his conversational gayeties. It is a truth uttered by Shakespeare, that

“Conceit in weakest bodies, strongest works,”

and well may the question be asked, what greater range can be found in the extremes of conceit than in a person of royal birth, clothed with the highest conventional power, and endowed with the lowest and weakest gifts of mind.

If it be a merit in a man that he is capable of selecting a good wife, there is no good reason why a prince should not have the benefits of such a distinction as well as other men.. It is certain that the queen of George II., had many qualities of mind far superior to those of her husband.² She was gifted with high aspirations, if not with superior talents. She manifested great respect for distinguished authors, and frequently sought their society that she might enjoy their conversation. “The queen had,” says Cooke, “doubtless, many of the weaknesses of a learned lady. We cannot notice, without a smile and a suspicion of affectation, her great affection for metaphysics; nor can all the eulogy of Doctor Clarke divert the ridicule

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 978.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 973.

which attached to her when she assumed the place of arbitress in the contest which was carried on between that profound divine and Leibnitz. But whatever might have been her skill in the abstract sciences, and however much or little she was capable of judging the merits of Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries, and the influence they had upon the evidences of Christianity, her judgment upon the more practical points of government was generally sound, and uniformly moderate."¹

The queen's influence over her husband, at the time of the death of George I., was known only to a few. No ambitious partisan, not even Compton, with all his opportunities for observation, sought her aid. She was entirely overlooked by the Tories.² They courted Mrs. Howard. Metaphysical studies were professedly the Queen's delight. If she did not comprehend their subtle teachings, she certainly manifested a commendable pride in a just appreciation of their importance. It was probably the skill and learning she possessed that gave her the power

"to distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and south-west side,"

and to see so much merit in a faithless husband, and greatness in a stupid king. She knew better than any one, what he was. Whatever she had to say in his favor must have been dictated by an unscrupulous pride, and with but very little regard to truth. With her knowledge of his treacherous and grovelling heart; of his immodest impudence and unredeeming fickleness,—it excites amazement that she could honor him even with a nominal courtesy. Yet, in some respects, they were alike. They had the same ungovernable passions, the same insensibility to the decencies of life. She discovered a sensible judgment, however, in the choice of companions distinguished for their high character and learning, while he acquired a most unenviable reputation by a shameless companionship with unprincipled women. As parents, they sinned alike, in their unnatural and revolting aversion to their first born, Frederic, the Prince of Wales. If royalty can survive such trials and stand, it must be by the grace of God, and the charitable spirit of a loyal people. If society may have continued existence while royalty indulges in every species of violation of those

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 126.

² Lord Hervey says, "The King himself was so little sensible of this being the case, that one day enumerating the people who had governed his country in other reigns, he said Charles I. was governed by his wife; Charles II. by his mistresses; King James by his priests; King William by his men,

and Queen Anne by her women-favorites. His father, he added, had been by any body that could get at him. With a significant, satisfied, triumphant air, he turned about, smiling, to one of his auditors, and asked him, 'And who do they say governs now?'" —*Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 78.

domestic rights and privileges which constitute the moral, religious and social being of the soul,—it remains to be seen in what degree the nation is dependent on the agency of a king whose providential relations so far overshadow his personal insignificance, as to make comparison painful.

It was remarked by Lord Chesterfield, that the King “was thought to have a great opinion of his own abilities; but, on the contrary, I am very sure that he had a great distrust of them in matters of state.” This view is reasonable. Though a man may conceal his ignorance from others, he cannot utterly conceal it from himself. A long experience of what he can, and cannot do must practically remove, in a large degree—the illusory conceit of the most inordinate self complacency.

When the death of his royal father was announced to George II., by Walpole, he was utterly incredulous. He was in no mood to be disturbed, or to be decent to the great ex-minister. It was certain he had no foresight of the greatness about to be thrust upon him, nor was he prepared to comprehend the magnitude of the duties imposed upon him by the British Constitution. That it was difficult for him to realize the fact, that the King was dead, and that he was to be his successor,—should surprise no one. He probably had instinctive sense enough to know his unfitness for the obligations and duties of the crown, and in some degree, to see the extent of his own ignorance. His first acts were in keeping with his feebleness. He saw government only as a nominal business, where the prerogatives of royalty were above the prerogatives of mind, and where the companions of his social life were presupposed to be equal to the high duties of state. It was not to be expected that he would trust his father's ministers. He had frequently characterized them as capable of every possible obliquity. He called Sir Robert Walpole “a great rogue and rascal,” and his brother Horace, “a dirty buffoon and scoundrel.” The Duke of Newcastle was complimented as “an impertinent fool,” and Lord Townshend, as “a choleric blockhead.” These had been the governors of the kingdom.

The news of the death of George I., was sent by express to Sir Robert Walpole. He was dining at Chelsea, when it arrived, and he left without delay for Richmond, where the Prince of Wales then was, to announce the event and to receive his commands. No man knew better just what to say to a Prince, who had so often denounced him, than Sir Robert Walpole. His brevity discovered no disposition to conciliate prejudice by multiplying words. “I am come to acquaint your Majesty with the death of your father,” was all he said. “The King,” to use the language of Lord Hervey, “seemed extremely surprised, but not enough to forget his resentment to Sir Robert one moment; neither his confusion nor his joy at this great change, nor the benevolence so naturally felt by almost everybody towards the messenger of such good news, softened his voice or his countenance in

one word or look.¹ Whatever questions Sir Robert asked him with regard to the council being summoned, his being proclaimed, or other things necessary immediately to be provided, the King gave him no other answer than—"Go to Chiswick and take your directions from Sir Spencer Compton."²

Though at this time, Speaker of the House of Commons, Treasurer to the Prince, and Paymaster to the Army, yet, Sir Spencer was without qualification for any important position in the government. He had long been in office, and was useful mostly in his knowledge of forms and precedents. He could execute according to what had been done, but he could not originate or advise. He was a polite subordinate, and was all deference to his official superiors. "His only pleasures," says Lord Hervey, "were money and eating; his only knowledge forms and precedents; and his only insinuation bows and smiles." Sir Robert was at no loss how to approach such a man. He knew his weakness and incapacity, and while he said nothing to embarrass his sense of inferiority, he omitted nothing that could be justly recited to his advantage. Sir Robert was conscious of his own strength comparatively, and could well afford to indulge in unreserved candor and magnanimity. No man better understood the needs of the government, or the wants of the nation. He not only humbly acquiesced in the change, but he asked the protection of a man who had not even the ability to protect himself, or to save the king without the aid of a statesman. Their consciousness of inferiority, and the active influence of the Queen,—led both the King and Sir Spencer to accept the counsel of Sir Robert. He secured power by graciously surrendering it. More than any one, it was the Queen who had placed Sir Robert as a competitor against Sir Spencer. The King's method of deciding the question of choice was amusingly primitive. He required both to make him a speech, and it need hardly be said that the comparison was fatal to Compton, who labored under the double disadvantage of obvious inferiority, and of having treated the Queen with thoughtless disrespect. Both had been consistent Whigs, though Compton never aspired to be a leader of party. The standard of judgment of the King was personal. If left entirely to himself his

¹ To use the amusing language of Thackeray, "The master always slept after his dinner—and woe to the person who interrupted him! Nevertheless, our stout friend of the jack-boots (Sir Robert Walpole) put the affrighted ladies aside, opened the forbidden door of the bed room, and knelt down in his jack-boots. He on the bed started up, and with many oaths and a strong German accent asked who was there and who dared to disturb him?" "I am

Sir Robert Walpole," said the messenger. The awakened sleeper hated Sir Robert Walpole. "I have the honor to announce to your majesty that your royal father, King George I., died at Osnaburg on Saturday last, the 10th instant." "*Dat is one big lie!*" roared out his sacred majesty, King George II.: but Sir Robert stated the fact." —*Four Georges*, p. 340.

² Hervey's *Memoirs*, George II., Vol. I, p. 81.

considerations of choice were often contemptible. He was incapable of comprehending that men might differ in opinion with pure and honorable motives, and he did not hesitate to use opprobrious language to all who opposed him.¹ Sir Robert Walpole was well acquainted with his temper and peculiarities, and led him to conclusions by influences adapted to his capacity and weaknesses. He relied mostly upon the Queen. Finding her indisposed, when about to be absent a few days, he seriously warned her against personal imprudence, blending practical advice with important truths which have become facts of history. This interview discloses so much of the disjointed, unthoughtful and un-law-like condition to which royalty and incompetent government is often liable, that its full relation, as given by Lord Hervey, is placed in the appendix.²

In studying the long reign of an obstinate and feeble monarch, the question naturally arises, how it was possible to administer the government and protect the nation. The King was too ignorant to be a leader, too obstinate to be a follower. He had the prerogatives of appointment, it is true, and was surrounded by statesmen of ability and experience, who were ready to serve him in council. But with the best materials for a cabinet, a wise selection is difficult where there is no judgment, and action is still more difficult where knowledge is wanting. Political organizations, when not well guarded against the cabals of ambition, the accidents of time, the prejudices of the weak, and the designs of the wicked, are not likely to be permanent, unless controlled by some law, or principle, inherent or traditional. Under such circumstances success may be reached by good luck, but not by systematic effort. A short period of success, of a year or two, or of three or four years, would hardly be noticed by a historian, as worthy of remark. Thirty years, or a whole generation, however, presents a subject entitled to consideration.

It is to be remembered that the predominance of individuality is barbarism; the predominance of classes is feudalism,—and the transition from feudalism to a higher civilization, is progress towards constitutional government.

In speaking of the rights and institutions of feudalism, Guizot says,—“They had no reality, no guarantee.” He continues, “If one is asked, what is meant by a guarantee, a political guarantee, one is led to perceive that its fundamental character is the constant presence, in the midst of the

¹ As Lord Hervey repeated the names of those who opposed him, the King tacked the following remarks to them:—Lord James Cavendish, “*a fool*.” Lord Charles Cavendish, “*he is half mad* ;” Sir William Lowther, “*a whimsical fellow* ;” Sir Thomas Prendergast, “*an Irish blockhead* ;” Lord Tyrconnel, a “*puppy that never votes twice together on the same side*.”—*Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 197. Puppy and fool were favorite words with the King.

² See APPENDIX, F.

society, of a will, of a power disposed and in a condition to impose a law upon particular wills and powers, to make them observe the common rule, and respect the general right.

“There are only two systems of political guarantees possible: it is either necessary there should be a particular will and power so superior to all others, that none should be able to resist it, and that all should be compelled to submit to it as soon as it interferes; or else that there should be a public will and power, which is the result of agreement, of the development of particular wills, and which, once gone forth from them, is in a condition to impose itself upon, and to make itself respected equally by all. Such are the two possible systems of political guarantees: the despotism of one or of a body, or free government.”¹

This analysis of Guizot, clearly states the process leading to despotism, or freedom, to a certain extent, but not fully. This control, whether it leads to despotism, or freedom, is always according to an acknowledged standard of principle, in the administration of government. In other words, it is the *manner* of meeting the wants of the people. There are so many different ways of doing the same thing, it becomes a matter of no small interest to understand the origin of these ways, and of their permanent tendencies.

In private life, men have established habits in their social, or domestic sphere, which practically characterize their intercourse with others. They are naturally kind and generous friends, thoughtful neighbors, considerate citizens, exemplary husbands and dutiful fathers,—or the contrary of all these. Or, they may not be the contrary of these, and yet, by habit or constitution, they may possess these qualities so indifferently, as to be counted as without, or beyond the influence of their refining tendencies. When men act as men, among men, they are permanently divided into classes. Not formally, but conventionally, by the voice of society. Men have a common repute, and by this they find their position,—and almost without words are estimated and classed.

So it is in a great degree with public men and political parties. Public questions, or measures, are discussed and decided according to certain great principles which constitute the policy of a nation, or by the habits of a party. Each political party not only claims to have a policy of its own, that is permanent and consistent, but it has a way of doing things which becomes a habit. Whether always consistent, or not, it may be said that each party has a two-fold character of its own. Not so much a character that is projected in outline by systematic foresight as by peculiar innate qualities of mind to be found in the natural constitutions of men, which

¹ Hist. of Civilization in Europe, Vol. I, p. 76.

influence them to act with a particular party in preference to another. To a certain degree this preference is permanent. Its permanency may be founded on a just discrimination of the present and prospective wants of society, or upon a basis that recognizes no interest but of self, no privilege but that of control. Its permanency may be, and often is, aided by prejudice, interest, or fashion,—or by traditionary or conventional pride, the bias of blood or family. In addition to all these perpetuating influences,—there are constitutional tendencies, in different minds, impelling forward to progressive action, or turning back, evincing a spirit of conservatism, an extreme reluctance to change, or to favor natural growth. Above all these direct and indirect causes, are to be found classes of men, of commanding talents, who are able to study society, the wants of men and nations, and to provide prudently and efficiently for the general welfare. They have their equals who coöperate, and their honest pupils who follow their lead. They have their inferiors, who trust them with implicit confidence, and who are willing to follow them without inquiry and without knowledge. They have their antagonists in men of opposite qualities, who believe in dictation and not in duty, in coercion and not in truth. These have their submissive tools, who are pledged for an interest, and their passive dupes who are willing to follow any lead in preference to doubting the fallacies of the past. Their knowledge of justice is not sufficient to control their instinctive fears of loss and danger. To them foresight is experiment.

In these opposing classes of men, may be seen, in all the variety of capacity, interest and motive, to-day and all time,—the Tory and Democratic parties. To a certain extent, each party has its servile adherents, and unprincipled managers. When conjoined with principle and progress,—the conditions of royalty, hereditary distinction and wealth,—may be counted as providential blessings. But, when linked with incapacity, dishonesty and inordinate ambition, they entail the saddest calamities upon a nation. Still, with all these varying sources of uncertainty,—there are certain features in political parties which ever remain unchanged. They make the likeness, the physiognomy, which in all ages is recognized as true to nature. The Tory is a representative man. So is the Democrat. Each is led by his instincts to find his fellows in sympathy. They cluster together in homogeneous action as particles of matter crystallize with chemical affinity, and almost with a precision of conscious intelligence.

As individuals have habits of thought and action, so have parties. A party of principle, but without statesmanship, is often made safe by its inherited habits. A party destitute of principle, is made more dangerous by the aid of talents, and if left to flounder in ignorance, and under the weight of an infamous past, it is sunk still deeper by the inevitable pressure of its habits. The future course of such a party cannot be predicted. If it were not kindly floated by an all-wise Providence beyond the confines of

existence, and deprived of its means to do harm by unforeseen accidents and combinations of judgment,—it would establish upon poor humanity the perpetual chaos of chance, and the unlimited woe of permanent evil.

Though the language may seem extravagant, still, it is fully warranted by the facts of history, that the habits of the democratic party are safer for the people to follow, even when guided by moderate ability,—than Toryism possibly can be when administered by its most illustrious leaders. In conflicts of principle, democracy always triumphs. Toryism never. This is an ultimate result, the triumph of truth,—through whose indestructible crucible all human judgments are made to pass, and by whose agency the abortive fruits of all error are forever destroyed.

It is true, the party of principle always has the irresistible advantage of fundamental laws. What possession is in law, this is in moral conflict. When the public mind is quiet, and society is apparently stationary; when philosophy and religion are temporarily exempted from the turmoils of speculative discussion, and government from debate; when men meet men with kindred motives, hopes and aspirations, and see no particular need for eminent talents, nor any particular evidence of their existence, even if needed, then the habits of such a party become important,—and public affairs are almost unconsciously carried forward by the latent force of eternal principle, and by the democratic instincts of men which need no training. In such a period, an inferior head of a nation, when aided by able counsellors, is permitted to have a nominal lead, though nothing above a common regency. He is protected against the wiles of unscrupulous opponents, and saved from the risks of ignorance and ambitious friends.

When George II. ascended the throne, he was conscious of no strength, except in royalty and in the democratic party. It was natural that his first step should be dictated by impressions of the royal prerogative, to select advisers in his own way, and according to his own impulses. His personal preferences were based on social predilections, with no comprehensive sense of duty to the public, and with no practical judgment as to the means to be employed in the administration of government. His first idea of a premier, was, doubtless, that he should be strictly subordinated to the crown. With him, statesmanship was but the knowledge of forms, the filling up of blanks spaced by custom and usage. It was viewed as a clerical duty. He soon found his error by comparison of men and by the aid of the Queen, and the appointment of Walpole instead of Compton, was seen to be a necessity. On the same principle that the Whigs were counted his friends, the Tories were declared to be his enemies. Neither his attachment to the one, nor his aversion to the other, became a subject either of doubt or inquiry. Thought and action were simultaneous.

While he was fully impressed with the importance of the democratic faith, though not versed in the philosophy of democratic truths, he was

equally prepared to repel and reject all counsel from the Tories. It must be borne in mind, that this was an uneducated period. The people did not fully comprehend the nature of government, nor the sources of its growth and strength. The nobility put forward their sons to declaim against an administration they did not favor, and the universities seemed to be but little more than schools to prepare young men for verbal conflict, and with but little regard to principles.

Party appeals to young men are not without precedent, and the example is not without followers in all ages. The motives which lead to such appeals are often questionable, inasmuch as they are generally connected with party suffrage. To connect the privileges of suffrage, on great questions, with inexperience or ignorance, and with special views to mere party, under any circumstances, is, to say the least,—an indirect attack upon the public safety. In speaking of this period, Cooke says,—“The Craftsman, and its fellow-laborers in the same cause, teemed with invectives against a ministry which had its power in the venal baseness of its supporters; the people were excited by splendid declamation, which seemed to breathe the spirit of the citizens of the ancient republics. The youthful scions of noble houses were taken from the universities and poured into the House of Commons, their minds yet occupied with the deeds of the patriots who live in the writings of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Livy.¹ Their fresh enthusiasm and real indignation lent the charm of sincerity and patriotism to the tactics of a faction. If many of these young declaimers wanted talent, none were deficient in energy and good will.”²

Youth is impulsive, impatient and confident. The mind is eager for action with a body full of natural energy, and it has but little means either to know itself, or to correct itself—by introspection. Baxter, in his personal narrative, enumerates seven opinions which he adopted in early life as incontestably true, which his maturer judgment found to be wrong. There are many such examples. Having but little or no experience in matters concerning the nature of man, or the organization of society, the young man surrenders himself to be controlled by his immature pride, or unschooled opinions. He becomes a power, if not sufficient for itself, it

¹ “They were made to believe,” says Speaker Onslow, “they were saving their country from destruction, and that *they* only could do it. But they were the tools and instruments of those who meant no such thing, and who were in opposition only because they had not the power, and made use of the virtue of these younger and better men to the quicker obtaining of it for

themselves, which when they had done, and manifested by their after actings what their former motives had been, many of their young followers soon discerned the cheat and showed their resentment accordingly.” —*Speaker Onslow's remarks on the Opposition*, Coxe, Vol. II, p. 569.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 134.

answers a subordinate purpose in the hands of ambitious partisans. The assumption of duties peculiar to manhood, and the gratification of being distinguished as a part of the community in which he lives, for the first time, are sources of pardonable weaknesses. Parents and guardians, friends and the family, the circumstances of interest and the hopes of distinction,—generally make up the circle of causes which carries forward and characterizes the mind of the young man when he is asked to adopt certain opinions, and to oppose others. Besides, there is an attractiveness in the freshness and ardor of young men,—when put forward with avowed motives of patriotism. They see no difficulty, they fear no error. It is not the father alone, in the harness of party, that sways the young man to turn his untried energies to public affairs. The proud mother, looking forward with the bright promises of hope; the loving sister, and the adored betrothed,—inspire him with happy visions of future greatness. He finds himself agreeably moved by an unlimited ambition, and nothing but hard experience will convince him that his enthusiasm is not judgment, and that his opinions are not knowledge.

The reign of George II. was in an age of corruption. “The accusation of wholesale corruption,” says Cooke, “is that which is always pressed the hardest upon Walpole and his administration; it may be palliated, but it cannot be denied, it may be excused, but it cannot be defended.”¹ * * * “It was not the minister who corrupted the age; his crime was that he pandered to the prevailing depravity. It is an observation, startling but true, that nothing but corruption—extensive, almost universal corruption, could have now preserved the Whig party. Theirs was the triumph of influence over prerogative—of money over power.”²

The same author thus speaks of a bill against bribery: “The Bribery bill, which became a law in the session of 1729, is one of those invaluable measures which have resulted from party contests. It was introduced by the Tories, to put an end to the expensive contests which had recently shaken their dominion, even over their own boroughs; its title was highly popular, and Walpole did not attempt to resist it. When, however, the opposition found that they had failed in one of their objects, that of entrapping the minister into resistance to a popular measure, they became less eager in their promotion of the bill. Many of the Tories thought its provisions inconvenient, and so careless were they of its fate, that, when it

¹ The accounts for the year 1727, contained an item of £250,000 for secret-service money; an immense sum according to the amount of the revenue of those days. the Pulteneys and the other opposition leaders, and was made the subject of incessant motions in the Commons.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 134.

This was fastened upon with eagerness by ² *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 138.

was returned from the Lords, it was received in a very thin house, and passed only by a majority of two.”¹

Whatever may be said of the corruptions of this period ; of the incapacity of the King, of the policy of Walpole, or of the party schemes of Bolingbroke, and of the Tories, there is one instructive fact upon record, questioned by no one, that is entitled to particular notice. It is a fact that clearly indicates not only a general reverence for the British Constitution, but an element of national permanency, a practical loyalty in the people and in their chosen servants,—that will in some degree account for the uninterrupted prosperity of the long reign of George II. This fact is the long continuance of Arthur Onslow, as the Speaker of the House of Commons. He was first elected in 1727, and resigned in 1761. More than any man, he was the representative of democracy during his period of service. He was not a politician, in the ordinary sense of the term, but a consistent statesman, of accurate knowledge and sterling integrity. He was true to his party, because his party was true to principle. Not because his party was always right, but much nearer right than any other party. One who knew him well, both as a pupil and a friend,² thus speaks of him: “Superadded to his great and accurate knowledge of the history of this country, and of the minuter forms and proceedings of parliament, the distinguishing feature of Mr. Onslow’s public character, was a regard and veneration for the British Constitution, as it was declared and established at the Revolution. This was the favorite topic of his discourse ; and it appeared from the uniform tenor of his conduct through life, that to maintain this pure and inviolate was the object at which he always aimed. In private life, though he held the office of Speaker above three and thirty years, and during part of that time enjoyed the lucrative employment of treasurer of the navy ; it is an anecdote perfectly well known that, on his quitting the chair in 1761, his income from his private fortune which had always been inconsiderable, was rather less than it had been in 1727, when he was first elected to it.”

The influence of one man, in official position by example, when respected, can hardly be over-estimated. When he combines ambition with duty, duty with modesty, modesty with courage, and knowledge with activity, and courage with integrity,—he disarms envy and commands the respect and confidence of all classes. He becomes useful to all, and does not seek to obtrude his views or plans upon any. All want him alike, all need him alike, though all are not prepared alike to follow him as a leader. The selfish partisan has occasion for his executive ability, but fears his counsel in the disclosure of motives. It required a Solon to declare a democracy,

¹ Hist. of Party, VOL. II, p. 149. Parl. Deb., VOL. VIII—Tindall. ² Mr. Hatsell.

but a Publicola to illustrate and regulate it.¹ What Solon desired and did not live to see, Publicola acted and enjoyed. Onslow had the ability to appreciate what a Solon had the genius to conceive, and to admire and honor what Publicola had the capacity and disposition to practise. He became the central point where differences were united without respect to party, or policy, and where government, however administered, demanded a pivot upon which to turn its machinery. Onslow, as a democrat, had the powerful advantage of principle, which opponents often claim, but seldom practise.

When great minds are placed outside of the governmental circle of power, and find their antagonists in a similar position, but without official influence, the government is then usually administered by a class of men who may be said to be the followers of a theory rather than its active leaders. Talent takes a stand above practice, and practice becomes the interpreted rule of theory. Party controversy ceases for a time, to give rest and recuperation to disputative mind, and relief and information to society. In such periods of practice, without active thought,—party importance is either disclaimed by the disappointed, or misrepresented by the unsuccessful. When democrats lose sight of democratic principles, and apparently succeed without a recognition of their importance; when Tories profess to find no party triumph in the administration of the government conducted by their opponents, and surrender monarchy in favor of an aristocracy,²—then it is, that we may look for Utopian dreams of millennial harmony, and of renewed confidence in no-party measures.

The Tories despaired of sharing power with the democrats, at an early period of this reign, and they looked to the people to control the changing elements of popular influence. The Whigs were too successful to be strongly united, and the Tories were too weak to succeed without coalition. Walpole was long the central power of the government, and while he enjoyed the unreserved confidence of the crown, he had but little difficulty in adjusting changes made necessary by personal jealousy or animosities, disappointed ambition, or the disruptions of party. On the one hand, he had to contend with powerful opponents, formerly of his own faith, who were too honest or too capable to be his compeers, or too proud to be his followers: such as Pulteney, Pitt and Townshend. On the other,—with the master spirits of Toryism, who scrupled at no expedient, paused at no political crime, or blushed at no inconsistency however absurd: such men as Bolingbroke, Wyndham and Lyttleton. He had not only the cares of the government upon his shoulders, but he had to meet and humor the whimsicalities of a weak and eccentric King, and to watch and foil competing partisans, and the dark and uncertain moves of gambling opponents.

¹ See Plutarch—Solon and Publicola.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 139.

Old party questions were renewed under amusing changes of championship, and party men were reminded of their mutability in political warfare. The same bold advancing, and backing, and dividing, and twisting and untwisting, among parties, as ever, filled the political record.

The Tories, in contradiction to their own record of practice, moved for a reduction of the Army.¹ Sir George Barclay opposed the ministerial estimate upon the broad principle, "that the keeping of a standing army in time of peace was a thing unknown to the laws and constitution of Great Britain, and destructive to the liberty of her subjects."² Shippen, with singular assurance, not only sustained these views, but showed a disposition to divert the public mind from the facts of history, and claimed that a standing army was one of the fruits of the revolution in the reign of William. The Tory claimed for his party the merits of democracy. "I own," he said, "that it gives me great concern to see gentlemen who have always valued themselves upon treading in the footsteps of those who brought about the revolution, act a part so inconsistent with their ancestors, by voting for this question. I know a set of men, under a different denomination, who have always been more moderate in their pretensions but more steady in their adherence to these principles. I am not at all inclined to revive any party distinctions, but, I will venture to say, sir, that, let any man compare the conduct of some gentlemen, who have affected to pass for Whigs, with that of gentlemen who have always been looked upon as Tories, he shall find the latter acting a part most consistent with the revolution principles. He will find them opposing the crown in every encroachment upon the people, and in every infringement upon the claim of right. He will never find them complimenting the crown at the expense of the people, when in post, nor distressing it by opposing any reasonable measure when out. Can some gentlemen, sir, who now affect to call themselves Whigs, boast of such an uniformity of conduct? can they say that times and circumstances never influenced the measures they pursued; or that, when they were in posts, they always acted in consequence of the principles they professed when they were out? Sir, I believe I have sat

¹ The motion was, "That the number of effective men to be provided for guards and garrisons in Great Britain, and for Guernsey and Jersey, for the year 1738, be, (including one thousand eight hundred and fifteen invalids, and five hundred and fifty-five men, which the six independent companies consist of, for the service of the Highlands) seventeen thousand seven hundred and four men; commission and non-commission officers included."—*Parl. Deb.* Vol. x, p. 375.

Cooke says, "Sixty years anterior to this time, the existence of a standing army would have been fatal to the liberties of the country. The whole nation which sulkily permitted Charles II. to maintain about five thousand guards, would have risen in a mass to resist an attempt to raise his levies to seventeen thousand."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 254. At the end of King William's reign, the army was seven thousand.

² *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. x, p. 376.

long enough in this house to convince gentlemen, if there were occasion, of very great inconsistencies in certain characters."

"There was much truth," says Cooke, "in the criminations thrown out against many of the Whigs, but there was something ludicrous in the claim put forward on behalf of the Tories."

Walpole had recommended that a standing army was necessary to maintain the present family upon the throne. This was a great mistake. It was in contradiction to Democracy.¹ Of this truth he was evidently persuaded, for he defended the measure with confessed reluctance. His party thrusts at Shippen were just, but they were inapplicable to the subject. His concluding reason, that "we must look upon it as an evil which we are obliged to submit to, for the sake of avoiding a greater," was another mistake. It was a Tory remedy for a Tory evil. A Whig had no greater power to defend a standing army than a Tory. Not so much, for while the former was speaking against the democratic doctrines of the Whigs,—he had no choice but to repeat what had always been denounced as the errors of the Tories. A truth is not changed because it is uttered by its enemy any more than an error becomes a truth because it is spoken by an honest man. A standing army is a standing threat. It is neither calculated to conciliate bad men, nor to influence good men. It naturally originates, or increases, the discontent of both. Another Tory fallacy was adopted by the Secretary at War, Sir William Yonge. He mistook discontent for insolence, protest for sedition. He says,—“The insolence of the people in all parts of the kingdom is risen to a height that makes it unsafe for the civil magistrate to do his duty without the assistance of the military power.”² The Duke of Newcastle reviewed the state of the nation, and foreign relations, and considered the chances of peace and war,—and favored a standing army upon the possibilities of the future. He was well answered by Lord Mansfield, and in democratic language. “I think,” said he, “all the dangers he has mentioned, either abroad or at home, depend upon may be’s which must always subsist.” * * * “It is not possibilities, my lords, it is not probabilities, nothing but certain, immediate danger, ought to induce us to agree to the keeping up of such a numerous army as we have at present.” * * * “These considerations, my lords, show, that if the noble lord’s may be’s should become shall be’s, a reduction of our army could be no great disadvantage to us, nor could it enhance any danger we can be under from invasions or insurrections.”³

¹ “There was at this time,” says Cooke, “no cause for national alarm at the power of the crown, nor any possibility that the military force now asked for would be abused.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 255.

² *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. X, p. 431.

³ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. X, p. 512.

There is much good sense in the speech of Lord Bathurst, in the House of Lords. He favored a militia system as more efficient than a standing army, and quoted the experience of the Grecians against Persia, and of the Romans against Carthage, in confirmation of his views.¹ "It is a strange doctrine in a free country, my lords," said he, "to say, that because some laws have been enacted, or some things have been done, that are disagreeable to the people, therefore a numerous standing army ought to be kept up, in order to compel the people to submit. This is a doctrine, my lords, I shall never approve of: even as to the drinking of gin, if it could be no way prevented but by a standing army, I should be for leaving the people in possession of that darling liquor, rather than attempt to bereave them of it by such means; for in that case, an army that could take gin from them, could likewise, and probably would, take their liberties from them also." * * "Do not let us make the people slaves, in order to make them sober; do not let us ruin the people, for the sake of compelling them to pay their taxes."² Pulteney, and Sir John Barnard opposed the bill with much ability. The former declared it to be "as impracticable to dragoon people into morality, as into religion; nor can a standing army make a free people quiet subjects, any other way than by making them humble slaves."³ Sir John expressed his fears that it was intended to make a Standing Army a part of the constitution. He practically illustrated the subject in language that is worthy to be remembered:—

"As I have opportunities of knowing somewhat of the country of England in general, I can venture to say, that a constable at the head of his posse, by a warrant from a justice of the peace who is beloved, can do more than a colonel at the head of his regiment. I say, Sir, a justice of the peace who is beloved; for I am far from thinking that all of them are beloved; though I believe they generally are so, when it is known they are not influenced by any guidance from within these walls."⁴ These few words explain the true principles of government. This debate is an instructive one, inasmuch as it clearly shows how uncertain the Tories are when they oppose a power only because they cannot control it, and how ready they are to stultify themselves when they deem it expedient to surrender the principles of their own party. In saying this, it would be an injustice not to mention an exception in Sir John Hynede Cotton, who was not only a Tory, but a Jacobite. His just and candid allusions to the records of democracy are highly commendable. When the Tories attacked the minister, denying his party the right to call themselves Whigs, he not only acknowledged their true record, but pointed out the inconsistency of

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 547.

² Ibid, p. 549.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 485.

⁴ Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 434.

the administration in its course. He said, "Sir, I have had the honor and happiness to be intimate with many gentlemen of that denomination. I likewise, Sir, have read the writings of many authors who have espoused these principles; I have sat in this house during some of the most material debates that have happened betwixt them and the Tories; and, sir, I can declare from my own experience, that I never knew one who acted on true Whig principles, vote for a standing army in time of peace. What the principles of the Whigs in former days were, sir, I can only learn from reading or information; but, sir, I have heard of Whigs who were against all unlimited votes of credit; I have heard of Whigs who looked upon open corruption as the greatest curse that could befall any nation: I have heard of Whigs who esteemed the liberty of the press to be the most valuable privilege of a free people, and triennial parliaments the greatest bulwark of their liberties: and, sir, I have heard of a Whig administration who have resented injuries done to the trade of the nation, and who have revenged insults offered to the British flag. These, sir, are the principles, if I am rightly informed, that once characterized the true Whigs. Let gentlemen apply these characters to their present conduct, and then, laying their hands on their hearts, let them ask of themselves, If they are Whigs."

The Whigs adopted Tory measures without acknowledging Tory principles, and the Tories defended Whig principles but opposed the Whig party. Walpole resorted to Tory expedients to sustain a Whig administration, and Shippen claimed for the Tories a more consistent democratic record than the Whigs could show for themselves. Pulteney could see no difference between the Whigs and Tories,—and he deemed it to be the part of integrity to acknowledge both without being true to either. But a single member of Parliament had the courage, in his simplicity, to magnify the merits of Toryism in the measures of the Whigs. This was a brief speech of Col. Mordaunt, "one of those unhappy partisans," says Cooke, "whose zeal is far more fatal to their friends than to their foes." With an unlimited ambition to serve his party regardless of consistency, he boldly declared that if it were necessary to save the Whig party by quadruplicating the army he would vote for it. The minister had admitted the principle, and why should he hesitate to vote for the application? The mingled expressions of party indignation, and of party joy which followed these declarations afford an amusing example of human weakness. The Whigs were indignant because he identified a Tory absurdity with the principles of their party, and the Tories were delighted to see one of their party enormities honored by being placed in the frame work of a Whig administration. Profession and practice met as strangers. The democratic principles of the revolution were finally acknowledged by all, and by these the nation was saved in its strength, and prospered in its growth.

In 1737, a most important subject was introduced in the House of

Commons by Sir John Barnard. It was "A Proposal towards lowering the Interest of all the Redeemable Debts to 3 per cent. and thereby to enable the parliament to give immediate ease to his Majesty's subjects, by taking off some of the taxes which are most burthensome to the poor, and especially to the manufacturers, as likewise to give ease to the people, by lessening the annual taxes for the current services of the year."¹ The amount of the national debt, February 1, 1737, was £47,855,943 3½. The public funds were at a considerable premium, in 'Change Alley, and Mr. Barnard considered it an unpardonable neglect on the part of Parliament not to take measures to reduce the interest. The people were heavily loaded with taxes, and he was confident that such a measure would give them essential relief. "By the reduction of interest," said he, "a few thousands will suffer, or think they suffer, by their not being able to heap up riches so fast, or to live so luxuriously or conveniently, as they might otherwise have done; but continuing our taxes, and the present high rate of interest, millions will suffer, and hundreds of thousands will at last be utterly undone."² He believed that the rate of interest on public securities had always had, and always will have, a great influence upon the rate of interest between man and man, and that as interest on private securities will always be higher than on the public,—it was the imperative duty of the government to lower the latter, that the former might be reduced as necessary to the business prosperity of the nation. His speech upon this subject discovered great ability and practical learning, and led to long and exciting debates. He regarded it as "highly requisite for every nation to take every possible method for increasing its trade, and improving its land; and that nothing can tend more to either of these purposes, than a low rate of interest for the use of or forbearance of the payment of money between man and man." He instituted a comparison between the high rates of interest in England, and the low rates in France and Holland,—showing the disastrous results upon Trade, Industry and Navigation. "This single advantage, Sir," said he, referring to the difference of interest only, "is of itself sufficient to exclude our manufactures from every market in the world, where our rivals can come in competition with us."³

This measure was chiefly defended by the landed interest, and it was bitterly opposed by the moneyed classes. "Some of those," says Coxe, "who were averse to the measure, declared themselves incapable of giving their opinion, without due reflection and more information."⁴ It was opposed by Walpole as ill-timed and inexpedient. His friends, who had always voted together upon most subjects, were divided upon this. It was urged

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 72.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 91.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. x, pp. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79.

⁴ Coxe's Walpole.

as an objection that a considerable part of the South Sea Annuities belonged to widows and orphans, and to persons who are proprietors of small sums, and such an appeal was not without its effect. It was calculated to excite the sympathy of members in support of measures proposed to protect widows and orphans. Rich men during all time have made this appeal to the legislator. It is made with great solemnity as if private sympathy were an element of public economy. This subject was alluded to by a distinguished member of parliament more than two hundred years ago, Sir Josiah Child. It was an old objection at that time. In his treatise on the importance of a low rate of interest to the industry of a nation, he says,—“That old objection about widows and orphans, I have, I think fully answered in my former treatise; but because I sometimes meet with it, I shall say a word to it here, viz:—1. Widows and orphans are not one to twenty of the whole people; and it is the wisdom of law-makers to provide for the good of the majority of the people, though a minor part should a little suffer. 2. Of widows and orphans, not one in forty will suffer the abatement of interest for these reasons:” He gives several reasons for his opinions, the first of which will suffice in this connection, viz:—“Of widows and orphans nine of ten in this kingdom have very little or nothing at all left them by their deceased relations; and all such will have an advantage by the abatement of interest, because such an abatement will increase trade, and in consequence occasion more employment for such necessitous persons.”¹ It would be economy to seek out the number of widows and orphans, and to provide for them by direct and liberal appropriations from the public treasury,—rather than to permit the fact of their holding securities so to shape the policy of the government as to lead to general ruin, or of loss to the many.

It was also urged, but without force or historical accuracy,—that a low rate of interest was ruinous to trade, and to general prosperity. In a letter to Mr. Trevor, Horatio Walpole acknowledges, that although he fully justified the principle of the bill, still, as Sir Robert Walpole was much opposed to it, and in view of its unpopularity,—he thought it would be imprudent to push it. Its discussion led to much excitement and great bitterness of feeling,—and it was defeated by a large majority.² Its defeat caused much rejoicing. The event was celebrated by a general illumination of the city, and it was with difficulty that the mob was prevented from burning the house of Sir John Barnard. It is a humiliating fact, to be acknowledged at any time, that a public debt, and an increasing number of public creditors,—is nothing less than adding seriously to the

¹ “A New Discourse of Trade,” etc., Preface, p. xxxi. ² Parl. Deb., Vol. x, p. 147.

public dangers. How far Walpole was influenced by this consideration, to oppose what he knew to be right, but which he deemed to be inexpedient, there is no record to show.

A similar bill was brought forward by the Pelham administration in 1750, and carried through with but little opposition. "This was looked upon," says Tindall, "to be a very bold measure in the minister, and some of his best friends, even the day before the vote passed the House of Commons, endeavored to persuade him against it."¹ In alluding to it, Smollett says,—“The capital measure which distinguished this session of parliament was the reduction of the interest on the public funds; a scheme which was planned and executed by the minister, without any national disturbance or disquiet, to the astonishment of all Europe. What was denominated as unaccountable obstinacy on the part of Pelham, by his doubting friends, was really allowed to be by them in due time, his extraordinary foresight, good judgment and firmness.

A more striking example of Walpole's want of confidence in principle is to be found in his treatment of the Dissenters. The Protestant Dissenters were among his most devoted and active friends. They were uneasy, and justly so. They felt themselves degraded under their disabilities. He had repeatedly given them assurances of relief. They were entitled to it. At no time was he fully prepared to meet their wishes. They had his open and undisguised sympathy, but they wanted it redeemed by action. He admitted the ready disposition, but he declared that he had not the power to serve them. They were either too early, or too late; the parliament was adverse, other business too pressing, or the ministers divided; the elections were pending, or the Church uncertain,—so that frequent postponements had almost exhausted their patience, and justified doubts as to his sincerity.² Toleration sometimes, may be impracticable, but it is the mission of democracy to remove all the obstacles of intolerance at the earliest practicable moment.

When a motion was made, in 1736, for the repeal of the Test Act,³ Walpole was not only embarrassed but alarmed. He remembered his promises with confusion, for he could see no way to redeem them. He sent for their representative men, and frankly told them, that “he was in their power, that they might ruin him, and that he could not choose a parliament without their assistance; but, if they would give him their interest, they might depend upon his utmost endeavors to serve them.” These promises were

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. XIV, p. 619.

² From a passage in the Craftsman, (No. 509) it appears that Walpole denied that he had ever promised to serve the Dissenters.

³ Act of 25th, of Charles II., “for preventing dangers, which may happen from Popish recusants.” Parl. Deb., Vol. II, p. 1016.

repeated in the ministerial papers.¹ The Dissenters were again pacified by his earnest protestations of devotion to their cause, and instantly took measures to notify their friends throughout the kingdom, how they were to act, how they were to vote, and these instructions were implicitly followed. With such encouragements, they had just reason to expect that parliament would take early action in promoting their cause. But in this they were again doomed to be disappointed. Nothing seemed propitious. The affairs of Europe were in a disturbed state, the high church party imagined that popery was gaining ground in the kingdom, and toleration seemed an impending danger. The cry of "The Church in danger," was dreaded by the minister. He knew its potency. He remembered the effects of the impeachment of Sacheverell. "He had been successful," says Cooke, "in his endeavors to reconcile the Tories to the present dynasty; and he feared to shock them by a proposition which they considered little less than impious." The clergy were quiet, and he preferred they should remain so.

To yield to the demands of the Dissenters at this time, would only aggravate old dangers, and invite new ones—and with no probability of advancing their cause. Such was the judgment of Walpole, but those who had patiently waited so long for the careful and expedient minister, could wait no longer. The question was brought forward in parliament by Mr. Plumer and Lord Polwarth. It was unfortunate for the Dissenters, that they were not recognized among the leaders either of the Whig or Tory party. The Tories were with Walpole in this defence of intolerance, and though the opposition Whigs supported the Dissenters, they were not united with any hopes of success. Mr. Plumer, in moving the repeal, professed to have no doubt as to the result of his motion.² "I make no doubt," said he, "of having the unanimous assent of this House to what I am about to propose: and, in my opinion, it would contribute greatly to the glory of this generation, as well as the honor of this House of Commons, to have it agreed to *nemine contradicente*. He protested most solemnly, that the Dissenters were as true Christians, and revered the institution called the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and were as loyal to his majesty, and the Protestant succession, as the Established Church could be. He regarded the requisitions of the Test Act as Anti-Christian, inasmuch as it had a tendency to influence unworthy men to take the oath of office for the mere sake of place. It was legislative persecution.

In the speech of Walpole, in reply, says Tindall, "he expressed himself

¹ The London Journal and the Gazetteer. was apprehended by those who were for it,

² "This motion was, at that time," says Tindall, "generally thought to be made not with any hopes of success, but because it that its miscarriage would lose the affection of the Dissenters to the minister."

so cautiously with regard to the Church, and so affectionately with regard to the Dissenters, that neither party had cause to complain of him." He was evidently persuaded of his inconsistent course on this subject, for he commences with a personal explanation. "Sir," said he, "as I have hitherto appeared to be an utter enemy to all persecution, I hope my disagreeing with this motion will not be looked on as any sign of having changed my opinion, or of my having any intention to alter my conduct for the future: so far otherwise, Sir, I have still, and I hope shall always have as tender a regard for the Dissenters of all denominations, as any man can have, who is a true member of the Church established by law."

With such a comprehensive mind as that of Walpole,—how could he ever expect to meet the wishes of the Dissenters,—so long as he assumed "that in every society there ought to be an established religion?" and so long as he believed that "the repeal of the Test Acts would raise most terrible disturbances and confusions; for with respect to all posts and employments that go by election, we should have all the Dissenters combining closely together to bring in their friends, which would of course breed many riots and tumults."¹ With Dissenters he classed the Roman Catholics, and non-jurors. "As I am a member of the Church of England," he continued, "and think it the best religion that can be established, I think it my duty to prevent its being ever in the power of such men to succeed in any such attempt; and for this purpose, I think it absolutely necessary to exclude them from any share in the executive part of our government at least; because if the executive part should once come to be generally in their hands, they would probably get the legislative part likewise, from which time it would be in vain to think of preventing, in a peaceable manner, their doing whatever they had a mind."² He believed it absolutely necessary to exclude all dissenting officers from the army, and he did not regard such exclusion any more of a hardship, or punishment, than it would be to exclude a man of five foot and a half from being a soldier in the guards." As for the admission of unworthy persons to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,—the law did not provide for any such possibility, except "from the criminal and irreligious neglect of the minister who admits them."

In these views, are to be found democratic wishes connected with Tory errors, and a Christian theory with anti-Christian practice. The state does not necessarily embrace the tenets of any particular church, and the creed requisitions of a church properly find no place in the formation of a state. Conformity of opinion in theology, strictly speaking, can in no respect be regarded either as loyalty or treason, to the civil government. Man's

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. IX, p. 1055.

² Ibid, p. 1054.

relations to his God, centre in his individuality, and his conscience becomes his rule; but his relations to man and government are personal and conventional,—involving alike the interest of others with his own. He is accountable for both classes of duty: the former is with himself and Maker; the latter is a joint and defined interest to be regulated in common with others, for the equal good of all. In respect to individual freedom, religious and political parties are alike. The extent of conformity is the limit of organization,—and even if the element of infallibility be claimed, by any sect or party, it can be only for self preservation, and not for all. Civil government provides for all, and it is a tyranny if it assumes a principle of exclusion or inequality. Government is not founded on charity or philanthropy, but on the basis of equal rights and justice.

Lord Polwarth made a conclusive reply as to the absurdity of Walpole in assuming that toleration was dangerous to the peace and unity of the nation. He referred very appropriately to the history and experience of Scotland and Holland, to show that nonconformity in religion was not incompatible with the prompt and loyal administration of the government by officials of a different religious faith. And yet, he dishonors the philosophy he sought to defend, when he proscribes the Roman Catholics, and non-jurors. “With respect to non-jurors and Roman Catholics,” said he, “the hardships put upon them are not for the sake of a scruple of conscience in any matter of religious concern, but because they are enemies to the state, and to the present happy establishment.” Whatever may have been true of Catholics, at this time, this is not Catholicism now.

An article was published in the “*Daily Gazetteer*,” which, it is said, contains the views of Walpole accurately stated. The following is an extract: “If the Dissenter hath the gift of common sense, he will carry his claim of indulgence no further than may be compatible with the genius and circumstances of the people; he will have the wisdom to insist on no other demands of right than what he may probably maintain against the power of the Church and reconcile to the opinion of the common people. He will rather wait till the former have less dominion, and the latter fewer prejudices, before he contends for full and perfect liberty; since to set up his scheme, while such power remains unbroken and such bigotry unconvinced, must draw the united violence of both upon him, and probably end in the destruction of his beloved cause.”¹ This may be considered as good advice under the circumstances of the case,—but it is not in harmony with his philosophy.²

¹ *Daily Gazetteer*, No. 227.

² “The conduct of the Whigs upon this occasion,” says Cooke, “was that rather of prudent than lofty-minded men. But it is a melancholy fact, that the chivalrous

honor, unswerving regard to principle, and recklessness of consequences, so admirable in private life, utterly disqualify their possessors for the government of a free country.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 213.

Perhaps the best test of principle, to illustrate the intolerance of this period, was the action of Parliament on the petition of the Quakers. The bill introduced and defended by Walpole, provided "that the tithes and Church dues, which they conscientiously refused to pay should, when the amount was not litigated, be levied by a summary process before two justices of the peace." It was not a party question, so much, as one of mere political expediency. The Quakers, unlike all other people, claimed exemption from the common obligations of society,—and to tolerate their peculiarities of conscience, was a grave question for the consideration of statesmen alone. This bill was opposed with little success in the House of Commons. It was passed by a majority vote of one hundred and sixty-four to forty-eight. In no respect were the dogmas of theology compromised, of any denomination, and yet, the petition was bitterly opposed by the clergy.

"The power to persecute," says Cooke, "was never yielded without a struggle: the bishops sounded the alarm, and when the bill reached the lords, the whole clergy were arrayed against it." * * * "It is a fearful sight to behold the ministers of a Christian church, standing before their brethren to claim a power that could be only useful to gratify the darkest and most malignant passions of our nature. Fifteen bishops divided against this bill, not one for it. It was rejected by fifty-four votes against thirty-five." ¹

During the reign of George II. the Tories were constantly watching the people, and proposing measures for consideration, which they had opposed, but which had been popularized by their opponents. They proposed remedies for evils which they had practised, and the enjoyment of privileges they had denied. They embraced opinions which they had denounced as dangerous, and labored against measures it was always their pride to approve. Any mode of acquiring influence was acceptable to them, if it promised present success. Even the alienation of parental affection, and the subversion of filial duty, in the royal family, were not so sacred in their eyes as to be exempt from their degrading and speculating hands.

History affords no example more revolting to the refined reader, or more shocking to the true heart of affection,—than is to be found in the sad record of Frederic, Prince of Wales, the eldest son of George II. He was born in 1707, and he was early distinguished by all that is hateful in character, or degrading in practice. A more unkind destiny was never allotted to man, though born to be a King, and the father of a King.² The forlorn and moaning Sloth,³ and howling Hyæna are not supposed to be at any

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. ix, p. 1166.

² He was the father of George III.

³ In speaking of animals of the tardi-

grade family, the Ai, and the Unau,—Sir Charles Bell says,—“Modern travellers express their pity for them: whilst other

time repugnant to their dams, or abhorrent to their kind. But poor Frederic, whose horoscope must have presented all the malignant stars in conjunction, was ushered into life, heir to no joy, and apparently capable only of evil, and banished beyond the confines of paternal love. With all his defects and sins, from what we know of him; his reputation, touched by the hand of charity and consideration for what he was, and for what he could not be,—has more of grace and less of acrimony in it,—than is to be found in the reputed language and conduct of his royal parents. His lot was a most unnatural one, for he was without a father or mother,—though both were living. He was not permitted to accompany them in their first visit to England, nor to go there until after his father's accession to the throne.

No man, perhaps, had more frequent opportunities to see the Prince, or to hear of him,—than Lord Hervey. He could be called with great propriety the Boswell of the King and Queen.¹ Proper allowances, however, should be made in view of his personal differences with the Prince, and his natural spirit of detraction.² The brief, though eventful period of the Prince is worthy of special notice, because it shows that royalty is not exempt from the common conditions of chance, nor from the severe and bitter trials of party. The mistakes of democracy are temporary in their nature, and they not only find a speedy remedy, but if rightly viewed and studied, may be made morally profitable.

The analysis of Prince Frederic's character, by Lord Hervey, is a psychological curiosity. Only a portion of it is given. He says,—“The contradictions he was made up of were these:—He was at once both *false* and *sincere*; he was false by principle, and sincere from weakness, trying

quadrupeds, they say, range in boundless wilds, the sloth hangs suspended by his strong arms—a poor ill-formed creature, deficient as well as deformed, his hind legs too short, and his hair like withered grass; his looks, motions, and cries conspire to excite pity; and, as if this were not enough, they say his moaning makes the tiger relent and turn away. This is not a true picture: the sloth cannot walk like quadrupeds, but he stretches out his strong arms—and if he can hook on his claws to the inequalities of the ground, he drags himself along. This is the condition which authorizes such an expression as ‘the bungled and faulty composition of the sloth.’ But when he reaches the branch or the rough bark of a tree, his progress is rapid; he climbs hand

over head, along the branches till they touch, and thus from bough to bough, and from tree to tree: he is most alive in the storm, and when the wind blows, and the trees stoop, and the branches wave and meet, he is then upon the march.”—*Sir Charles Bell on “The Hand, its Mechanism, and Vital Endowments, as Evincing Design,”* p. 82.” In all conditions of nature, organized existence is benignly endowed with special functions capable of enjoyment.

¹ John Wilson Croker, Editor of *Memoirs of Lord Hervey*, says,—“Lord Hervey is, I may venture to say, almost the Boswell of George II. and Queen Caroline—but Boswell without his good nature.”—*Preface to Memoirs*, p. LIX.

² Hervey's *Memoirs*, VOL. I, p. LX.

always to disguise the truths he ought not to have concealed, and from his levity discovering those he ought never to have suffered to escape him ; so that he never told the truth when he pretended to confide, and was forever telling the most improper and dishonest truths when anybody else had confided in him.

“ He was at once both lavish and avaricious, and always both in the wrong place, and without the least ray of either of the virtues often concomitant with these vices ; for he was profuse without liberality, and avaricious without economy. He was equally addicted to the weakness of making many friends and many enemies, for there was nobody too low or too bad for him to court, nor nobody too great or too good for him to betray.

“ He desired without love, could laugh without being pleased, and weep without being grieved ; for which reason his mistresses never were fond of him, his companions never pleased with him, and those he seemed to commiserate never relieved by him. When he aimed at being merry in company, it was in so tiresome a manner that his mirth was to real cheerfulness what wet wood is to a fire, that damps the flame it is brought to feed.

“ His irresolution would make him take anybody’s advice who happened to be with him ; so that jealousy of being thought to be influenced (so prevalent in weak people and consequently those who are most influenced) always made him say something depreciating to the next comer of him that advised him last.

“ With these qualifications, true to nobody, and seen through by everybody, it is easy to imagine nobody had any regard for him : what regard, indeed, was it possible anybody could have for a man who had no truth in his words, no justice in his inclination, no integrity in his commerce, no sincerity in his professions, no stability in his attachments, no sense in his conversation, no dignity in his behavior, and no judgment in his conduct.” ¹

To afford the reader a contrast in respect to the same character, the following is quoted from a letter that Lady Bristol addressed to her lord, 7th of January, 1729. She says, “ I introduced Lady Hervey to the Prince of Wales, the most agreeable young man it is possible to imagine, without being the least handsome ; his person little, but very well made, and genteel ; a liveliness in his eyes that is indescribable, and the most obliging address that can be conceived ; but the crown of all his perfection is, that great duty and regard he pays the King and Queen, with such a mixture of affection, as if obliging them were the greatest pleasure of his life, and they receive it with the utmost joy and satisfaction, and the father’s fond-

¹ Hervey’s *Memoirs George II*, Vol. II, p. 196.

ness seems to equal the tenderness of the mother; so that, I believe, the world never produced a royal family so happy in one another. *Pray God long to continue it.*"¹

Such are the examples of a courtier's testimony. Whether true or false, they are framed to flatter the hand of power, or to defend it whether right or wrong.

This year, 1729, Lord Hervey returned from Italy, and he soon became intimate with the Prince—only to establish a friendship to be broken. The friendship that was so soon broken seemed to have been transferred to the King and Queen. It is the power of *to-day*—that moves the common world, and but few mark their own channels of duty. Hervey was but little more than a creature of the court, to do the biddings of, and to smile at the capricious whims of royalty, however foolish or however wicked. He even over-stepped the bounds of decency in argumentative endeavors to widen the deplorable breach between the mother and son, though at times he ventured to make a hopeful, or apologetic defence of the latter against the vile surmises and unfeeling predictions of the former. The mother, when left alone to speak, or act, showed a rancor that was unnatural, and an imprudence that was revolting. It may be said by way of apology, however, that it could hardly be expected of human nature, that an impulsive woman inheriting power, should quietly control her passions, when her first-born became leagued with the political enemies of his parents, and of the party to which they belonged.²

In this bitterness of feeling towards the Prince the King and Queen were in harmony. "Lord Hervey took occasion upon this subject, (when he had permission to call the son a liar in print, to use the language in his *Memoirs*,) among many other things, to say he did not believe there ever was a father and a son so thoroughly unlike in every particular as the King and the Prince, and enumerated several points in which they differed, as little to the advantage of the Prince as to the dispraise or displeasure of the King. The King said he had really thought so himself a thousand times, and had often asked the Queen if the beast was his son. Lord Hervey said that question must be to very little purpose, for to be sure the Queen would never own it if he were not."³ In a joking conversation, they finally concluded:

¹ Hervey's *Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. xxxi.

² Prince Frederic, according to court etiquette, led his royal mother to dinner by the hand every day; and yet she repeatedly "cursed the day in which she had given birth to that nauseous beast." His sister, the Princess Caroline, was equally malignant, and prayed publicly and repeatedly that "God would strike the brute dead with

apoplexy." The King spoke of him always as "a brainless, impertinent puppy and scoundrel." Such was the singular state of feeling prevalent among the members, both male and female, of this exalted and exemplary family. — *Dr. Smucker's Four Georges*, p. 120. *Lord Hervey's Memoirs*.

³ Hervey's *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 471.

that the child might have been "*a changeling*," "a child put in a cradle instead of another." The King was extremely pleased with this idea, and he wished that such a statement could be proved to be true. In reply to Lord Hervey, who was disposed to remind the Queen of her weakness in thinking too favorably of her son's understanding she said, impatiently, "My dear Lord, I will give it you under my hand, if you are in any fear of my relapsing, that my dear first-born is the greatest ass and the greatest liar, and the greatest *canaille*, and the greatest beast in the whole world, and that I most heartily wish him out of it."¹

When the Queen was on her death bed, the Prince manifested the deepest concern, on hearing of the dangerous illness of his mother, and expressed a desire, in the most respectful and dutiful manner, that he might be "admitted to the honor of seeing her."² Lord Hervey had anticipated such a request, and with a view to prepare him for it, asked the King what should be done in case it were made. The King said, "If the puppy should, in one of his impertinent affected airs of duty and affection, dare to come to St. James, I order you to go to the scoundrel and tell him I wonder at his impudence for daring to come here; that he has my orders already, and knows my pleasure, and bid him go about his business: for his poor mother is not in a condition to see him act his false, whining, cringing tricks now, nor am I in a humor to bear his impertinence; and bid him trouble me with no more messages, but get out of my house."³ But the Prince's wish had been formally communicated by Lord North, and a verbal or written reply, by authority of the King—became necessary. When advised of this, his Majesty flew into as great a rage as he could have done had he not been prepared. "This," said he, "is like one of the scoundrel's tricks. No, no! he shall not come and act any of his silly plays here." The King positively refused to give his consent to a written reply, and the following verbal message was delivered by Lord Hervey to Lord North—in presence of the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Pembroke:—

"I have acquainted the King with the message sent to Lady Pembroke, and his Majesty has ordered me to say that in the present situation and circumstances his Majesty does not think fit that the Prince should see the Queen, and therefore expects he should not come to St. James."

The King regarded this language as much too mild. It was with difficulty that they persuaded him to consent to it. It was read by Lord Hervey as stated, but he was ordered to give no copy of it. Lord Pembroke offered some palliatives to the wording of the message, but the King told him, angrily,—“My Lord, you are always for softening, and I think it is

¹ Hervey's Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 472.

³ Hervey's Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 499.

² Ibid, p. 299.

much too soft already for such a villain and a scoundrel ; it is much softer than I ordered Lord Hervey to prepare it ; so pray go, and let it be given this moment, and be sure I am plagued with no more impertinence of this sort, for I will neither have the poor Queen disturbed with his silly noise, nor will I be troubled again with it myself." ¹

In the same day, the Queen spoke of the subject to the King. "She wondered *the Griff* (the nickname of the Prince) had not sent to ask to see her yet, it would be so like one of his *paroîtres* ; but sooner or later I am sure one shall be plagued with some message of that sort, because he will think it will have good air in the world to ask to see me ; and perhaps hopes I shall be fool enough to let him come, and give him the pleasure of seeing my last breath go out of my body, by which means he would have the joy of knowing I was dead five minutes sooner than he could know it in Pall Mall." ² The King then told her all, and assured her that she should not be troubled, as he had taken care to prevent it. Still, in speaking to a dying mother, his heart seemed to relent, for he told her, that he had no objection to her seeing the Prince if such was her desire. "I am so far from desiring to see him," said she, "that nothing but your absolute commands should ever make me consent to it. For what should I see him ? For him to tell me a hundred lies, and to give myself at this time a great deal of trouble and to no purpose. If anything I could say to him would alter his behavior, I would see him with all my heart ; but I know that is impossible." ³ Such were the dying words of a mother to a father respecting their offspring in the chamber of death. ⁴ And yet, when uttering her last solemn counsel to the young Duke of Cumberland, who was then only sixteen years old, she said,—“As for you, William, you know I have always loved you tenderly, and placed my chief hope in you ; show your gratitude to me in your behavior to the King ; be a support to your father, and double your attention to make up for the disappointment and vexation he must receive from your profligate and worthless brother. It is in you only I hope for keeping up the credit of our family when your father shall be no more. Attempt nothing ever against your brother, and endeavor to mortify him in no way by showing superior merit.” ⁵ This was in 1737. In 1751, the Prince of Wales died. When the news was communicated to his

¹ Hervey's Memoirs, VOL. II, p. 502.

² Hervey's Memoirs, VOL. II, p. 503.

³ Ibid, p. 504.

⁴ That the Queen was not entirely insensible to the spirit of forgiveness is made clear by the record of her intercourse with Sir Robert Walpole. He had offended her at an early period by coarse and rude lan-

guage. He called her "*a fat bitch*." When, however, he favored an appropriation to her as Queen, of £100,000, instead of £50,000, she good-naturedly sent him word that "*the fat bitch* had forgiven him." —Hervey's Memoirs, VOL. I, p. 62.

⁵ Hervey's Memoirs, VOL. II, p. 512.

father, the King, who was watching a game at cards, at Kensington, he merely replied,—“Dead, is he?” Then going round to Lady Walmoden, he remarked to her in an indifferent tone:—“Countess, Fred is gone!” and then the game proceeded.¹

Soon after her affectionate address to the young Duke of Cumberland, the Queen “took a ruby ring off her finger, which the King had given her at her coronation, and, putting it upon the King’s, said, ‘This is the last thing I have to give you—naked I came to you, and naked I go from you. I had every-thing I ever possessed from you, and to you whatever I have I return. My will you will find a very short one: I give all I have to you.’ She then asked for her keys, and gave them to him.” When in health she had frequently expressed a wish in case she died that the King should marry again, and now she repeated it as her dying counsel, “upon which his sobs began to rise and his tears to fall with double vehemence. Whilst in the midst of this passion, wiping his eyes, and sobbing between every word, with much ado he got out this answer:—‘*Non, non; j’aurai des maitresses.*’ To which the Queen made no other reply than—‘*Ah! mon Dieu! cela n’empêche pas.*’ I know this episode will hardly be credited, but it is literally true.”²

Much that is painfully revolting might be added to show that neither the splendors of the palace, nor the privileges of royalty, are any more in harmony with domestic bliss, than the humblest rustic and the rural cottage. But it would be an error to omit in a notice of the death-bed scene of Queen Caroline—the graphic language of Thackeray. With irrepressible humor, tinged with sadness, he says,—“There never was such a ghastly farce. I watch the astonishing scene—I stand by that awful bedside, wondering at the ways in which God has ordained the lives, loves, rewards, successes, passions, actions, ends of his creatures—and can’t but laugh in the presence of death, and with the saddest heart. In that often-quoted passage from Lord Hervey, in which the Queen’s death-bed is described, the grotesque horror of the details surpasses all satire; the dreadful humor of the scene is more terrible than Swift’s blackest pages, or Fielding’s fiercest irony. The man who wrote the story had something diabolical about him: the terrible verses which Pope wrote respecting Hervey,

¹ The following epitaph appeared in the Jacobite press:—

“Here lies Prince Fred,
Who was alive and is dead.
Had it been his father,
We had much rather;
Had it been his brother,
Still better than another.
Had it been his sister,
No one would have missed her.

Had it been the whole generation,
Still better for the nation.
But since ’tis only Fred,
Who was alive and is dead,
There is no more to be said.”

—Dr. Smucker’s *Hist. of The Four Georges*, pp. 149, 150.

² Hervey’s *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 515.

in one of his own moods of almost fiendish malignity, I fear are true. I am frightened as I look back into the past, and fancy I behold that ghastly, beautiful face; as I think of the Queen writhing on her death-bed, and crying out, 'Pray! pray!'—of the royal old sinner by her side, who kisses her dead lips with frantic grief, and leaves her to *sin more*; of the bevy of courtly clergymen, and the archbishop, whose prayers she rejects, and who are obliged, for propriety's sake, to shuffle off the anxious inquiries of the public, and vow that her Majesty quitted this life 'in a heavenly frame of mind.' What a life! to what ends devoted! What a vanity of vanities!"¹

These remarkable and painful domestic scenes have been given with a double purpose. To show that royalty is not above the ordinary conditions of humanity, and therefore less safe for the people because more permanently placed beyond the power of remedial measures, than democratic institutions. Also, to illustrate the grave truth that it is not for the best good of society, that woman should be connected with the exciting political cares and responsibilities of government.

Let this important point be more fully explained. Religious wars, it has been truly said, are the most bloody and cruel. This fact sounds strangely when repeated. It might be reasonably supposed, that the professed followers of the Prince of Peace would be likely to strive to emulate their Master's examples. Not so. Their course, however, is strictly in accordance with the laws which govern the human mind. Religious conceptions of duty, it must be remembered, embrace all the sacred obligations incumbent on man, to his kind, to society, to self, and to his God. A deep and honest sense of such momentous accountability constitutes a mental power, that is a law to itself; that knows no conditions, that recognizes no compromise. It is a principle in action,—whether right or wrong. To believe the wrong, sincerely, does not make it right,—but when wrong convictions are honest the conduct of the mind is aided by the full force of its integrity. A holy war, therefore, as a matter of belief and duty, is regarded as the sacred cause of the Almighty. What is blood and slaughter, dire suffering and calamity, when viewed in connection with man's eternal destiny, and as in accordance with the will of God? The passions and propensities are enlisted in the holy cause, and to hesitate or doubt, would be to violate the divine examples of sacrifice, and to question Infinite Wisdom. So it is, with the moral sense of man,—when demanding perfection regardless of nature, or of practicable means. Compromise is sin; necessity an impending doom. Man assumes to represent the divine attributes.

When we come to the honest politician, the statesman, a class of men are reached who deeply study their country to ascertain and understand its

¹ Four Georges, p. 350.

condition, resources and wants, and next to religion in importance, the subject demands and receives the attention of the keenest powers of intellect and awakens to fearful activity all the passions of the soul. Patriotism is associated with the greatest glory in the affairs of life, and treason with the greatest infamy. Political parties divide friends and kindred, and often supplant the affections by bitter hate. Man in view of great duties demanded by his country, is ready to forswear his offspring who heeds not his will, and woman loses her maternal instincts and banishes the child of her affection, if he opposes the government where she has official position or influence. Society cannot be benefited by any political organization that makes no distinction between the sexes, or where by any possibility woman loses the high and sacred qualities of noble sentiment and immaculate maternity. The intensity of a mother's love sometimes rescues the greatest sinner, or assuages the severest trials of humanity; but when exasperated by party hate, and perverted by unnatural duties,—it increases the terrible evils it was designed by a merciful God to lessen, or to avert.

What successes and splendors would compensate a King, what courtesies and devotion could gratify a Queen, while placed at enmity with a child like Prince Frederic? What are the blessings of existence to such a child, while hated by his father and mother,—and of what benefit to society can such beings promise, or secure,—so long as they remain the doomed outlaws of that domestic circle where God has placed the centre of human happiness?

But the saddest feature of such alienations of the affections, when in any way connected with government, are yet to be stated. The afflictions of a family are within a narrow circle and private, but of a royal family they concern the world and are public. When it was known that Prince Frederic was at variance with his royal parents, that his habits were to be gratified and his wishes met, the veteran Tories and apostate Whigs united in opposition to the administration, making the heir to the throne the central point of a new court, antagonistic to that of his father. The Prince was soon led to see and feel "his own high dignity and power in the state," and to look upon the King no longer "as an irresistible master." Cooke says, "there was a rival court within the precincts of St. James'. The insidious and intriguing, but highly gifted Carteret;¹ the courtly Chesterfield; Pulteney, brilliant in conversation as in debate; Wyndham, who preferred the allegiance of the old Jacobites to a Tory Prince; above, and revered by all these, the "all accomplished Bolingbroke," who conversed in language as elegant as that he wrote, and whose lightest table-talk, transferred to paper, would, in its style and matter, have borne the test of the most searching criticism;² these, the veteran leaders of the united opposition,

¹ Marchmont Papers.

² Chesterfield's Letters to his son.

formed the society in which the young Prince lived ;¹ these were his political tutors and his personal friends. Truly, the genius of the age appears to have been monopolized by this opposition." * * * "But Frederic was not the only pupil in this school of politics ; he had younger friends and companions, who, prepared by the same tutelage, were sent into the House of Commons, to herald the advent of a new generation. Of these, Polwarth has been already mentioned ; the delicate and sensitive George Lyttleton must be noted as another."²

Unlike the conditions which govern men in their consent to promotions, royalty, *ex-officio*, must have its advancements without regard to merit. The less the merit, perhaps the greater the need of titles. In 1717, the Prince was created Duke of Gloucester ; the next year the Garter was conferred upon him, and in 1726, he became the Duke of Edinburgh.³

Ordered home from abroad, a stranger in England, coldly received by the King and Queen, and banished from the privileges of St. James, it was not strange that he should seek his companions from among the aliens of authority, or that he should be avoided by the parasites of the court. Bolingbroke was the master spirit of this faction. It was his ambition to revive the Tory party. The great fact to be noted here and remembered is the readiness of the Tories to organize their plans even upon the basis of death itself. Without deploring the want of character and capacity in the Prince, for the throne, they looked for the death of the King as the only means of realizing their hopes and schemes of ambition. Bolingbroke thought, probably, that as his greatest misfortune had been in the death of a Queen, it was but right that Providence should enable him to find his greatest gain in the death of a King. All his extraordinary natural gifts and acquired energies were directed with the sole motive to reinstate his darling party with its ancient surroundings of privilege and perquisite—reinforced by fresh accessions from the divided ranks of the democracy. The administration was too strong for hopeful attack from without,—and its Tory opponents saw no prospect of success but in an event which they could not with decency declare, though their acts indicated no principle above the fruits of the grave. But their reliance upon death shared its impenetrable uncertainties,—for it was the Prince that died, and not the King. Such an event, permitted by the King of Kings, was calculated to startle the boldest political adventurer, and to awe the humblest. Such an example of moral and political treason, for party purposes, is not without its impious precedents, and they will be multiplied upon the pages of history so long as man is capable of treachery, or igno-

¹ Bolingbroke left England early in 1735.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 323.

³ Dr. Smucker, p. 95.

rant of democratic means of national safety. The death of the Prince "demolished," says Cooke, "the scheme which Bolingbroke had labored so assiduously to perfect. The opposition Whigs shrunk back to their own faction, and the Tories were left naked and powerless.¹ Fox spoke of this event as the annihilation of all opposition; he said he did not foresee a debate during that session, and thought the only difficulty the minister had to encounter was that of getting forty members together every day to make a house."²

For a time, Pitt was hopefully counted as among the friends of the Prince. But he was too honest, and too wise—to give permanent influence to a faction, or to act with such associates. Although the King was prejudiced against him,—he was too much of a power to be neglected by the administration. "He is represented," says Cooke, "by a contemporary as, at this time, swaying the House of Commons, and uniting in himself the dignity of Wyndham, the wit of Pulteney, and the knowledge and judgment of Walpole." "He was for the King," says another, "kind and respectful to the old corps, and resolute and contemptuous to the Tory opposition."³ The King's prejudices were soon "changed into awe of his gigantic powers," and he was placed in the cabinet. His judgment always led to success. He was the idol of the people. Whatever he approved, was approved by them. The peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, concluded this year (1748), became the subject of general congratulation irrespective of parties.⁴

It would be interesting and instructive to dwell upon other subjects which were debated during the reign of George II., but we are again admonished to be brief. We can do but little more than allude to principal measures—and dismiss them, simply affording the reader a glimpse or two of party machinery and legislative progress. The profit of such political surveys, however perfect, or imperfect, is more or less—according to the disposition of the reader to give them further study and reflection. The

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 358.

² Fox to Williams, 1751. Coxe's Life of Walpole.

³ See Memoirs of the Pelham Administration.

⁴ This treaty has been furiously assailed by several Tory historians who compare it to that of Utrecht. These writers seem to suppose that the same terms can be obtained from a victorious, as ought to be forced from an humbled enemy. Bolingbroke thought differently. "If the ministers," he wrote, "had any hand in it, they are

wiser than I thought them; if not, they are much luckier than they deserve to be."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 356. By this peace the treaties of Westphalia in 1648, of Nimeguen in 1678 and 1679, of Ryswick in 1697, of Utrecht in 1713, of Baden 1714, of the Triple Alliance, 1717, of the Quadruple Alliance in 1718, and of Vienna in 1738, were renewed and confirmed. Signed on the part of England by John, Earl of Sandwich, and Sir Thomas Robinson, Oct. 7, 1748.

history of principle makes its own chronology. The degrees of progress do not correspond with the order of consecutive dates. Cause and effect are convertible terms in political philosophy. As time is not always an element in the solution of political problems, it is quite important that if it cannot be an aid to inquiry, it should not be permitted to be an obstacle. A party that is permanent in its nature and perverse in its practice, is to be followed according to its acts, and not according to its theory or professions. The Tory party, out of power, seeks the popular means of restoration, only to abuse them,—for when invested with authority it does not hesitate to subvert the government to save the party.

With no disposition to do justice to the measures of Walpole, the Tories became not only reckless in their charges against him, but utterly indifferent to their own record of consistency.¹ They had no rule of action but incessant opposition, no object but success.² The subject of foreign policy was exhausted by factious debates, and Parliament sustained the minister by large majorities.³ Though the hateful Excise Bill had been slaughtered and buried even by its author, yet Pulteney did not abate his hostility. “I am persuaded,” said he, “he still has the same good opinion of it, and waits only for an opportunity to renew it.” Walpole exclaimed, with impatience,—“I, for my own part, can assure this house that I am not so mad as ever again to engage in anything that looks like an excise.”⁴

In the time of Anne, the Tories refused to allow any officer to hold a commission in the army who would not promise faithfully to serve the Queen “without asking questions.” Under George II., they were unwilling that the Duke of Bolton and Lord Cobham should be dismissed from their rank, without attempting “to deprive the crown of the right of dismissing its superior officers of the army except upon a sentence of a court martial, or upon an address of one of the Houses of Parliament.”⁵ Walpole was at a loss how to regard such a radical innovation in the constitution. “We have heard of monarchies,” said he, “aristocracies, democracies, of oligarchies and anarchies; but should this proposition take place, I am persuaded, the government of this country would soon become what may be called a stateracy, an army-government, which is a sort of government was never yet established in any country; and such a government as, I believe, no man in this nation would be fond of: I shall not run out in compliments to the gentlemen of the army, but I hope those gentlemen

¹ Even Smollett says,—“It must be acknowledged, the opposition were by this time irritated into such personal animosity against the minister, that they resolved to oppose all his measures, whether they might or might not be necessary for the

safety and advantage of the kingdom.”—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. ix, p. 284.

² *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. ix, p. 284.

³ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. ix, p. 254.

⁴ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. ix, p. 201.

⁵ *Hist. of Party*, Vol. ii, p. 186.

will not take it amiss, if I say, that I do not desire to give up our present form of government, in order to come under their government.”¹ But Tindall, with no disposition to discuss a question which no one gravely entertained, says,—“But to say the truth, the party neither expected nor desired to succeed in the motion.”²

Another bid of the Tories for popular favor, was the “Place Bill.” It was entitled, “A Bill for securing the freedom of Parliament, by limiting the number of officers (civil and military) in the House of Commons.”³ The extreme provisions of this bill in favor of the people at the expense of the crown,—made it unsafe for Walpole to oppose it. It was virtually a party pledge to the electors simply to gain their votes,—but with no sincere purpose to establish a policy which such a measure seemed to promise. “Several friends of the minister,” says Coxe, “were strongly inclined to favor the bill, and others could not venture to oppose so popular a question at the eve of a general election. The motion was also so agreeable to the sentiments of many among the Whigs, who usually supported government, that the minister did not use his influence on this occasion.”⁴ The bill was negatived by a vote of two hundred and thirty against one hundred and ninety-one, but with no effect on the general state of parties.

But one of the most sagacious party movements of the opposition to Walpole was made by Bolingbroke, viz: the repeal of the Septennial Act. What was professedly designed for preserving the peace of the nation at a dangerous juncture, by a party then in power, may not always serve that party when out of power. It was a bold proposition, and it fully developed the peculiar capacity of the Tories to deny their own philosophy when expedient, and to dishonor their own precedents when in conflict with their plans. This was no embarrassment to them, however, as the Whigs were in a more mortifying predicament,⁵—having to defend a law which was passed by their influence in violation of principle in view of a supposed emergency. The Tories assumed to wield, with apparent delight, the efficient weapons of democracy against a Tory doctrine. Walpole’s speech against repeal was a good specimen of party ingenuity. It requires an apt skill in a democrat to give currency to Tory logic. When men speak of seditions and insurrections, and look for their causes only in the ignorance and instability of the people, always doubting others, but never doubting themselves, they may safely be ranked as Tories, not democrats. When men usurp powers not provided for in the constitution for which the usurpation is designed as a defence; when they confound the loyalty of government with the loyalty of party, it is a gross contempt of the people, and treason to the govern-

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. ix, p. 321.

² Ibid, p. 324.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. ix, p. 366.

⁴ Ibid, p. 368.

⁵ Parl. Deb., Vol. ix, p. 395.

ment they profess to serve. Self confidence is a virtue, when based upon principle, but a dangerous vice when derived from a selfish fear, or a forced conceit.

The most interesting feature of this debate was the personal attack of Sir William Wyndham upon the minister, and Walpole's reply. The party suppositions of Sir William, are amusing, but the counter suppositions of Sir Robert, are instructive. "It is impossible," says Coxe, "at this distance of time to appreciate exactly the minister's speech; but Tindall asserts that it was one of the best he ever made. The fate of these two speeches is singular: Sir William Wyndham, by his disrespectful allusions to the King, drew on himself a reproof, the justice of which neither himself nor his friends have endeavored to disprove. It was considered as an intemperate effusion, and did not lose the minister a single supporter in parliament, or a single adherent in the country; yet it has been carefully inserted by party writers, calling themselves historians, while that of the minister has been no less invidiously suppressed." * * "The immediate result of Walpole's unpremeditated reply to this studied attack, was a sense of shame in the opposition Whigs, and of indignation in the principal Tories, which interrupted their cordial union. Several Whigs re-united themselves to the minister, and the leading Tories, ashamed of appearing the puppets of Bolingbroke, though they continued to thwart and oppose the measures of government, did not, of themselves, bring forward any new question during the remainder of the session."¹ Pulteney complained bitterly that he had been duped by Bolingbroke, and Bolingbroke reaped the mortifying fruits of continued failure.

But the surest criterion of party principle is to be found in the application of the Writ of Habeas Corpus. The test discovers the real Tory however disguised, the honest democrat however misrepresented. This great writ of liberty, the most famous of the law, is a standing monument of glory to the democracy of Great Britain. At an early period, when government was personal, and its administration a despotism, they had the writ *de odio et atia*, which was directed to the sheriff, commanding to inquire whether a prisoner charged with murder was committed upon just cause of suspicion, or merely *propter odium et atiam*, for hatred and ill-will; and if upon the inquisition due cause of suspicion did not appear, then there issued another writ for the sheriff to admit him to bail.² This writ, according to Bracton, could not be denied to any one, it being expressly ordered by Magna Charta, to be made out gratis. It was limited in its application in the reign of Edward I., and abolished by statute in time of Edward III. in all cases whatsoever,—but revived by repeal of all

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. ix, p. 478.

² Blackstone's Com., Vol. iii, p. 128.

statutes contrary to the great charter.¹ When the rights and privileges of the subject were increased and provided for by a constitution, that was independent of the crown, this writ did not sufficiently embrace the wants of society, as they were secured upon a basis altogether above and beyond personal considerations. In the fourteenth century it was superseded by the writ of *Habeas Corpus*. Though this writ "is said to have extinguished all the resources of oppression," yet, its frequent suspension by Parliament, when most needed, and by unwarrantable judicial assumptions in substituting discretion for law, and delays for action,—led Pitt, in 1758, to cause a bill to be prepared, entitled,—"An Act for giving a more speedy remedy to the subject upon the writ of *Habeas Corpus*." This task was intrusted to a distinguished jurist, Charles Pratt, afterwards Earl Camden. It was supported in the House of Commons by Pitt and the Speaker, and was readily passed. A series of ten questions was propounded to the judges, and each judge gave his opinion independent of the others, on all the questions except the third.² By declining opinions on this, the judges were evidently agreed to avoid all part in political parties. "The bill now introduced," says Cooke, "served as a touchstone to discover the Whigs in principle from the Whigs in name. The King openly declared against it; Mansfield put forth all his influence to destroy it; and even Hardwicke, led astray by professional prejudices, joined his old enemy in its opposition." * * * "The debate in the lords shows the influence of the crown in that Assembly, and how lightly many of those who call themselves Whigs held the principles of their party." * * * "The Tory opposition proposed a compromise, and promised to introduce a measure in the next session which should pass with unanimity. The terms were accepted, but never fulfilled." *

The subject was thoroughly understood by Earl Camden. With great ability he gave an opinion from the bench. The following extract will afford to the intelligent reader some idea of its remarkable force, and eloquent terms. "The discretion of a judge is the law of tyrants; it is always unknown, it is different in different men; it is casual, and depends upon constitution, temper and passion. In the best it is oftentimes caprice, in the worst it is every vice, folly, and passion to which human nature is liable." +

Political history is useful only in so far as it gives examples of wisdom and justice as connected with accurate knowledge and pure motives,

¹ Blackstone, Vol. III, p. 129.

² The 3d Question was,—“What effect will the several provisions proposed by this Bill, as to the awarding, returning, and proceeding upon returns of such writs of *Habeas Corpus*, have in practice? and how

much will the same operate to the benefit or prejudice of the subject?”—*Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xv, p. 901.

³ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 392.

⁴ L. C. J. Pratt's judgment in *Doe dem. Hindson v. Kersey*, 4to. London, 1764.

whether it be in vindication of virtue, or in condemnation of vice. "What men allow themselves to wish," says Dr. Johnson, "they will soon believe; and they will be at last incited to execute what they please themselves with contriving." There is no permanent safety either to man or party, but in high and unquestionable motives. It is a crime to think what it is a crime to do. And when a nation becomes the subject of thought and duty, the first step is to determine the standard of principle to be adopted in action. When Paley wrote, what may be regarded as a maxim, that—"A family contains the rudiments of an empire," he but imperfectly repeated what had been more distinctly uttered four thousand years before by an Emperor of the Celestial Empire:—"He was careful to beautify the five canons, until the five canons could all be obeyed."¹ By this standard of principle, all men and measures are to be judged. When it is seen that enduring success can come only from its undeviating observance,—history acquires an influence in harmony with the dignity of truth as illustrated by Providence.

If George II. "was calculated by nature (only) for a pawnbroker's shop," as has been asserted, it imposes a duty upon the student of history, to look carefully to his surroundings, that he may gather the teachings to be found in the measures for which his advisers were responsible, and in the events during his reign which were permitted by God. The statesmen of his time, the leaders of opposing parties and factions, each in his own way, served his King and country, either with high and patriotic motives, or with motives to personal gain and aggrandizement.

Sir Robert Walpole, though he did not betray his party in possession, was not always true to it in principle. If he was prompt in denouncing toryism, he was not always proof against the temptations and expedients of its active exponents. He measured political events by the hour, with numerous precautions, as if God could not be trusted without the petty expedients of man. His motives in respect to the good of others, were doubtless stronger and purer than his avowed confidence in democracy. His judgment was too often permitted to modify his faith. His impeachment, and his defence will best afford the reader a just idea of the difficulties of his position, of the spirit and nature of the charges preferred against him, and of the manner in which he met them.² Though victorious

¹ The cardinal virtues recited by Paley and wives, order between superiors and are, Prudence, Fortitude, Temperance, Justice. The five canons of the Celestial Empire mean the five constant virtues: such as affection between parents and children, righteousness between sovereigns and subjects, distinction of duties between husbands and wives, order between superiors and inferiors, and sincerity among friends and associates.—"*Shoo-King, — The Historic Classic*," Book 1, p. 13. B. C. 2356.

² On the 13th of February, 1741, the threatened motion was made. The public expectation had been raised to the utmost

in the result, there were too many restless and aspiring men ambitious for place and influence,—to permit him to have an undisputed and undisturbed career. If he erred in trusting the Tories too much, it was more attributable to the action of the renegade Whigs combined against him, than in any cherished hope that the Tories would permanently adopt a policy which it was their constant aim to subvert the moment they had the power.

Walpole's thorough knowledge of his opponents, of the variety of motives which led them to conspire against him without just cause, gave him an undoubting confidence in his own ability to frustrate their factious schemes, and always to secure a majority in Parliament. He fearlessly proposed alliances which promised any degree of political influence, and he successfully resorted to expedients to divide his enemies. He attempted to control elections, so far as he could do it with decency, and even to subordinate the whims and animosities of royalty,¹—if such a thing were possible with a mind not above the most ordinary capacity, nor beyond the limits of impulse and prejudice. He did not succeed. He was disappointed. But when he saw that the chances were against him, he saw, also, the safety of retiring from official position. On the 9th of February, 1742, Sir Robert Walpole was created Earl of Orford, and on the 11th he resigned. Parliament was adjourned by the King to allow time for the formation of a new ministry.

"The chase was now ended," says Cooke, "the game was fairly hunted down, and the pack which had been halloosed on by Pulteney expected their spoil at the hands of their master. Seldom has one man held the political power which Pulteney now possessed. The King awaited his decision without power of resistance; the ministers held their places at his pleasure; and Walpole, fallen from his high station, felt that his life was at the mercy of his triumphant rival. The man who had been followed so long by the shouts of the populace now had it in his power to effect the measures he had before proposed, and to punish the conduct he had so often condemned."²

In opposing so earnestly and with such apparent sincerity the measures of Walpole, what were the motives of Pulteney? He was not ambitious to be a political leader. He disclaimed all desire for such a distinction. He said he was willing to act, but he would not lead. He declared, "he was weary of being at the head of a party, and would rather row in the galleys."³ And yet, he contributed largely of his means to aid the

pitch; the passages to the gallery were crowded at a very early hour; and the course was prodigious.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 278.

¹ He endeavored to persuade the King to

offer terms of reconciliation to the Prince of Wales, but they were rejected with contempt.

² *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 303.

³ *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 296.

opposition, and declaimed against the policy of the late minister with a show of candor and diversity of knowledge that embarrassed honest minds not having the means to verify his statements. His speech against Walpole was made up of such patriotic professions of duty, and confident assertions of fact that many were willing to follow such a leader without a knowledge of his motives, feeling that he was a disinterested friend to his country. He had a manner of making statements so general, and yet so positive, as to indicate the nicest details of knowledge without communicating any real information. He gave candor to insinuation, and authority to conjecture. Such men are to be found in all ages. One would suppose that he was sincere in the declaration of his belief that he had clearly made out a case, and he adds influence to his assertions by modestly assuming that he had done so. In giving his conclusions, he says,—“Thus, sir, I hope I have demonstrated, that at present we labor under great difficulties, and that our affairs are in the utmost distress both at home and abroad. This of itself is sufficient for raising a general suspicion against the conduct of our ministers.”

What could be demonstrated certainly should be of more effect than the raising of “a general suspicion.” Sir Robert Wilmot, in giving an account of the debate to the Duke of Devonshire, says,—“Sir Robert Walpole exceeded himself. He particularly entered into foreign affairs, and convinced even his enemies that he was thoroughly master of them. Mr. Pelham, with the greatest decency, cut Pulteney into a thousand pieces; Sir Robert ably dissected him, and laid his heart open to the view of the house.” They were followed by others with great ability and effect. The poet was inspired to immortalize him in a satire called “The Statesman.”¹ The subject was a good one. No character is so pitiful in history as a pompous parade of statesmanship without integrity and without knowledge. It so blends truth with error, merit with inefficiency, and character with imbecility,—that dignity is made ridiculous, and greatness doubtful. Pulteney was surrounded by such men as Pitt, Lyttleton, Marchmont, and others of high capacity, and if the motives which influenced him to make his speech were pure and for the public good, the same motives would have prepared him to exert his utmost in forming a cabinet to save his country from the misrule he was so ready to denounce. His course “clearly

¹ It was written by Sir Charles Hanbury Williams :

“Leave a blank here and there in each page,
To enroll the fair deeds of his youth;
When you mention the acts of his age,
Leave a blank for his honor and truth.

“Say, he made a great monarch change hands,
He spake, and the minister fell;
So he made a great statesman of Sandys,
(O that he had learnt him to spell.)

“Then enlarge on his cunning and wit,
Say how he harangued at the Fountain,
Say how the old patriots were bit,
And a mouse was produced by a mountain.”

showed," says Cooke, "that the quarrel in which he had engaged was not between Walpole and his country, but between Walpole and Mr. Pulteney. In the language of Bolingbroke,—'he had looked upon opposition only as his scaffolding, and he now discovered the greatest readiness to demolish it.'"¹ He eagerly made terms for himself and a few of his particular friends, bartered his popularity and consistency for a peerage, and assented to an arrangement which offered little prospect of any change of measures."² The most that he did to punish the fallen minister for the great crimes he had accused him of, was, to make no promises to save him until his own aspirations had been realized, and then to consent to a reconciliation.

No man better understood Pulteney than Walpole. He ignored the partisan, and addressed the man. He spared his pride, and humored his ambition. He flattered the Tories with Tory hopes, and their allies with encouragement against Tory pretensions.³ He approached the coalition by sections, dividing it against itself—and suggested timely precautions to Pulteney in respect to his personal safety; and he sufficiently deferred to "the waiters upon Providence" to secure a tolerable share of their favor and confidence. He did not omit to exert his influence with the King to accomplish his objects, and this was not done without difficulty. The moment he found a willing ear at court, he exclaimed with a spirit of triumph to his brother—"I have set the King on him!" and with a gesture, as if he were locking a door, he added,—“I have turned the key of the cabinet upon him.”

Thus Walpole placed his opponent in the hands of his coalition friends to be accused, condemned and sacrificed. The coalition Whigs were disappointed because expediency had failed. The coalition Tories were disgusted, because, instead of being able to dupe others, they were again duped themselves. Pulteney, no longer favored by the King, or trusted by the party which he honored but could not save,—had no alternative but to unite with the Tories, or retire from public life. As he could not do the one without dishonor, he chose the other course as more consistent with his

¹ Marchmont Papers.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 305.

³ It was not difficult to arouse the mutual hostility of the parties. Dodington, writing to the Duke of Argyle, says, "Your grace and I have often agreed that in the course of our acquaintance we never met with a set of gentlemen of more extensive honor and benevolence, truer lovers of their country, or more zealous to serve it, than the principal of the Tories. Several of them

have the same good qualities, but if the name of Whig comes across them it locks up all their faculties, and they cannot exert them. They stand like knight-errants of old under sudden enchantment, with their arms extended and their mouths open in the very attitude to act and speak for the man, when the charm comprehended in that syllable seizes them, and they can do neither for a Whig."—*Melcombe Papers*. Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 305.

frequent declaration:—"When I have turned out Sir Robert Walpole I will retire into that hospital of invalids, the House of Peers."¹

Another character upon the stage, worthy of notice, was Carteret, afterwards Earl Granville, whose jolly habits and loyal whimsicalities made him a favorite with the King. His easy motives rendered him a convenient tool, and his indomitable spirit of intrigue a useful politician to a party whose chief aim was success. Pitt gave his character when he alluded to the situation of the King, "as hemmed in by German officers and one English minister without an English heart," and who favored a policy which "rendered this great, this mighty nation, a province to a despicable electorate." He denounced him as "an execrable, a sole minister, who had renounced the British nation, and seemed to have drunk of the potion described in poetic fictions, which made men forget their country." His official career was denominated by the opposition—"the drunken administration." His course affords an instructive example of what a King can do with a drunken statesman, who was willing to act with all parties, and without being trusted by any. With such aids royalty was able to form a ministry that lasted forty-eight hours,² when it was compelled to surrender to terms dictated by the common intelligence of the nation. The crown was seen to be powerless. Walpole was out of office, but his genius was active and his spirit still loyal. He saved the nation from the humiliations incident to imbecility, and influenced the King to remove from his counsels such aimless politicians as Carteret. When the Earl of Wilmington died, who was permitted by Pulteney to *slide* into office, as first commissioner of the treasury,—by particular request of the King, Henry Pelham was appointed to fill the vacancy. This, too, was accomplished by the foresight and sagacity of Walpole. He was prompt to give the new minister his advice. "You must," he said, "form your government from your old friends, the old corps, and recruits from the Cobham squadron. Pitt is thought able and formidable, try him or show him. Fox, you can't do without. Winnington must be had in the way that he can or will be had. Your solicitor is your own and surely will be useful. Hold up the attorney-general, he is very able and very honest."³ There are other members of the law no ways contemptible, in party considerable, that may be had. It is your business now to forgive and gain. Broad-bottom cannot

¹ In a ballad, by Lord Hervey, under the title of "The Patriots are Come," Carteret is made to say of "*weathercock Pulteney*" that—

"To cheat such a colleague demands all my arts;

For, though he's a fool, he's a fool of great parts."
—*Hervey's Memoirs*, VOL. I, p. LIII.

² In irony, it was called, "the long administration."

³ The solicitor was Murray; the attorney-general, Sir Dudley Ryder.

be made for anything that has a zest for Hanover. Whig it with all opponents that will parley; but 'ware Tory! I never mean to a person or so; but what they can bring with them will prove a broken reed."¹ The friendship of Carteret was tendered to Pelham with assurances of fidelity, which were cordially received and estimated at their proper value. "Another instance of a contest in duplicity," says Cooke, "in which both parties were insincere, and neither deceived."

Pelham was soon made chancellor of the exchequer. He was a man of fair abilities, and moderation. He was popular and conciliatory to those he did not like, and polite to those he reluctantly trusted. His political friends were actuated by such a variety of motives, it was difficult to harmonize their views, to meet their wishes, or to promote their interests. By displeasing the King, he lessened his influence; by doubting the King's favorites, he multiplied rivals and gave power to enemies. Carteret was still an obstacle to judicious counsels. Unfortunately, with a presumptive hold upon the King, and with no standing with the ministers,—he availed himself of the circumstances of necessity, which, though he could not evade he hoped to alter, and found hope and strength in desperation. The struggle was between weak men who had not capacity to use power without abusing it, and those who deemed it the best policy to employ the wisest men, even if opposed by the crown. The Tories joined the coalition only to betray its objects, and to assert their own peculiar policy; and the adventurers from the Whig ranks had no common standard of principle except to control the weakest, and exclude the strongest.² It was an interesting conflict because it was a combination of royalty with incapacity against intelligence and statesmanship, of arrogant ignorance against knowledge.

When Pelham found it to be impracticable to fulfil his promises to the friends he most relied on, or to meet the unreasonable whims and prejudices of the King, he did not hesitate to advise the immediate resignation of the ministers. "This decisive conduct," says Cooke, "astonished, but did not alarm the King;³ he received the resignations with civility; and immediately intrusted the treasury to the Earl of Bath." With Lord Granville for a colleague, as a prerequisite condition, he immediately commenced the task of forming a cabinet. He approached the labor

¹ Coxe's *Memoirs of Pelham Administration*.

² The whole conduct of the Tories showed that the taint of Jacobitism had not been so thoroughly purged from them as their allies supposed; that of the Whigs showed that although they quarrelled among themselves when danger was distant, they were always

ready to unite against a Tory or a Jacobite enemy.—*Hist. of Party*, VOL. II, p. 334.

³ It is said he got alarmed at last, but not until the Earl of Bath's failure. He then shut himself up, and declared he would receive no more of the white staves, gold keys, and commissions that came pouring in upon him.

with such zeal and confidence, it was playfully said by one of the retired ministers, that it was unsafe for a person to be abroad nights for fear he would be impressed to become a cabinet minister. All who were wanted, and knew the difficulties of the proffered distinction, refused to negotiate. The Earl of Bath was compelled to confess his inability to serve the King under such conditions, and retired from the scene. Granville, unwilling to acknowledge a condition of things that would be fatal to his hopes—advised an appeal to Parliament: an expedient too absurd to find favor with royalty. The King had no choice but to surrender to Pelham, though with inadmissible conditions of appointment and proscription. These he was required to abandon. The Pelhams consented to resume their appointments, and were permitted to dictate their own terms. Granville soon found his own level by continued and persistent opposition, and the ministers united in demanding his dismissal from office—a demand that was ungraciously met by the King, when he, too, found that royalty was powerless.

The “Broad-bottomed” administration was formed in 1744 and continued to 1754,—till the death of Pelham. Though denominated broad-bottomed, indicating absurdly, that coalition views were broad views, it was essentially democratic. The fact is clearly stated by Cooke.¹

In the struggles for place, the Pelhams happily illustrated the principle, that in the sub-division and dispensation of power, weakness sees no safety but in kindred weakness. “Upon the death of his brother,” says Cooke, “all Newcastle’s characteristic jealousy was aroused; nor was it appeased by his appointment to the vacant post.” At this time the great master spirits of party, during the reign of George II., had been removed by death. Lord Orford died in 1745, and Bolingbroke in 1751. It has been said that in the death of Orford, Pelham lost a friend, the Whig party only an advocate. But in the death of Bolingbroke, the Tory party lost both friend and advocate. Walpole was too much of a Whig to leave his party and lose position; Bolingbroke was too much of a Tory not to serve his party for party purposes, though he had no position to lose.

It was natural that Newcastle should now regard himself as the chief adviser of the crown. He belonged to a class of men whose policy is defined by their fluctuating ambition. He flattered himself that but little could be done without his counsel, or aid—either at home or abroad. He was nervous and fretful without motive, and active without system. He was always ready to lead but unable to guide. In fact, there was much

¹ Although the name by which this administration is distinguished was intended to designate it as founded upon a perfect coalition of all parties; yet such is not the fact. Pelham’s was essentially a Whig cabinet. At first, a few Tories were admitted into subordinate stations—but they soon retired. —See *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 339.

sober truth in the witty remark of Lord Hervey concerning him, who said "he did nothing with the same hurry and agitation as if he did everything." His high rank, immense wealth and his disinterested disposition to serve the public gave him a great influence, but considerations of personal control outweighed public considerations of duty. He was willing to humor the prejudices of the King, to make a colleague of Granville, and proscribe Pitt. In attempting to form a cabinet he was careful to promote only those who could not become his rivals, and to avoid others who might become his masters. He was a compound of active elements: much of good, but little of wisdom. He was permitted by his sovereign to do his best until he demonstrated that he could do nothing.

Influenced by the weak fancies of a senseless pride, he imagined that Pitt could not be employed because the King disliked him; that the presumptions of rank and title were above the merits of ability and character,—and he endeavored to form a cabinet to suit himself and please the King. He failed. He could neither strengthen an old one, nor create a new one. He gave up in despair. The King called upon Fox. It appeared to be easy to do, what soon proved to be an impossible problem. With no confidence in himself, yet disposed to flatter the whims of his sovereign, Fox ventured to apply to Pitt for aid, but not for direction. Pitt was fully conscious of his own powers, and he comprehended the pressing wants of the nation. He was not offensively arrogant. He had patience to look fairly at the honest endeavors of incompetent men, so long as they did not ask him to share their responsibility. He knew well the candidates for place, and their capacity for public service. He said to the Duke of Devonshire what seemed like boasting,—but with him it was knowledge:—"He was sure he could save the country, and he was equally sure no man else could." He absolutely refused to confer with the proud Duke of Newcastle, on any terms; and when approached by Fox, he exclaimed,—“You, sir! Are you come from the King? When his majesty shall condescend to signify his pleasure to me, by any one entitled to my confidence and esteem, I shall not be wanting in expressions of duty to his Majesty and devotion to his service. I have no answer to return by you.”

“All hope being thus extinguished,” says Cooke, “Newcastle and his party resigned themselves to their fate; and the King, with undisguised reluctance, intrusted the formation of a ministry to Pitt. No step could be more popular. In the words of one who did not share the general enthusiasm,¹ ‘The eyes of an afflicted, despairing nation were now lifted up to a private gentleman, of a slender fortune; wanting the parade of birth or title, of no family influence, except by marriage with Lord Temple’s sister,

¹ Glover.

and even confined to a narrow circle of friends and acquaintances. Yet, under these circumstances, Pitt was considered as the only saviour of England.' Pitt was, at this time, confined to his bed by the gout; but he instantly made his arrangements."¹

The Duke of Devonshire was placed at the head of the treasury; the Earl of Temple was made the first lord of the treasury; George Grenville was appointed treasurer of the navy, and Legge returned to his post of chancellor of the exchequer. The treasury was settled on the 16th of November (1756); the admiralty, on the 20th; and Mr. Pitt received the seals on the 4th of December, two days after the parliament had met.

To use the language of Cooke, "The formation of this ministry was welcomed with a shout of approbation; the joy throughout the country was universal." * * * "Old patriots, who had long retired from the stage of public life, came forward to hail the promised millennium, and foremost among these was the Earl of Westmoreland, a veteran Whig, slow, but solid; one who would pursue his principles though they led to a precipice."² These manifestations availed nothing. The King had yielded only to a nominal change. This change was one of necessity, and he did not acknowledge its implied obligations. He was king, and why should he consent to be less? He had changed his ministers, but not his policy. They were his counsellors, but he did not accept their counsel. He had sense enough to see that while Pitt was chief, the King could be nothing. All were moved by one great mind, and that mind was not the King's. This was more than royalty could bear. Not satisfied with his past experience which compelled him to acknowledge the greatness of Pitt, he again resolved to repeat his folly in vain efforts to do without him. Pitt had compromised his popularity by trying to save Admiral Byng, whose death was demanded by the popular voice. By refusing to resign, he restored himself to favor in submitting to the indignity of a dismissal. Attempts to form a cabinet without Pitt were repeated, and with the same result as before. Pitt was re-instated much to the relief and joy of the nation. "Now," continues Cooke, "really commenced the Pitt administration, for Pitt, like Pelham, had enjoyed no power until he had stormed the cabinet and bound the King."

In quoting from the interesting volumes of Cooke, it has been done with a sense of duty, not only to the subject but to the reader, whose motives are presumed to be those of honest inquiry, and without prejudice to special sources of truth. These quotations have been made with commendation, thus giving just testimony to the accuracy and good sense of the author, who is entitled to high consideration for his labors in the great field of

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 375.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 377.

democracy. In dissenting, therefore, from his views contained in the following paragraph, it is done with no abatement of confidence in his judgment. Most likely further reflection would lead him to the same conclusions.

In speaking of Pitt's vaunted ability to save the nation when no one else could, he thus concludes :

" It belongs not to our subject to tell how well he fulfilled it. From the moment that he assumed the reins of government the panic which had paralyzed our efforts disappeared ; instead of mourning over former disgraces, and dreading future defeats, the nation assumed, in a moment, an air of confidence, and awaited with impatience for tidings of victory. The narrator of party-struggles has nothing to do with this era ; party was extinct ; the mastery of Pitt's genius was felt in every bosom ; dazzled by his genius, borne onward by a tide of success, the nation followed his counsels as the dictates of a superior being, and rose, as one man, to do his bidding. France, lately so insolent, felt his power and bled from every limb ; that people, who lately revelled in the anticipation of invading and plundering Britain, now fled the seas at our approach, and trembled, even upon their own shores. In each of the four quarters of the globe were our arms at the same time triumphant ; in each our alliance was deemed the best assurance of safety. It was not the Whig or the Tory party which did all this—it was William Pitt. The plan of operations was his, his colleagues heard and obeyed." ¹

Such examples of statesmanship, in such critical periods of danger and difficulty, are precisely the ones most fully to illustrate the great principles of democracy. How can we estimate the genius, character and acts of William Pitt, or of any man, but in view of his ability and judgment in which are to be found the elements of success or failure? What gave him greatness above rank or title, power above royalty, discernment above blindness, wisdom above error, and judgment above accident,—but a comprehensive knowledge of principles and of the means of their proper application ; and who, in the language of the poet,

" Consults his own clear heart, and nobly dares,
To *be*, not to be *thought*, an honest man."

What is it that discerns the use and beauty of democratic truths, in all the variety of their application, but the gifts of genius that make the man, the citizen, the democrat—a statesman, and the statesman a patriot? With such a leader, the democratic party becomes triumphant and invincible, but without such a party what could such a leader accomplish? With such

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 385.

a leader and such a party, all party lines appear to be obliterated. They are invisible. Not because they do not exist, but because when democracy is true to itself, all opposition is paralyzed by the irresistible glare of truth, and the bold spirit of duty. It is shapeless, powerless, fruitless. The people join hands with a common zeal. They see a system in the administration of public affairs that commands their admiring consent and confidence, and inspires them with a noble and lofty pride in the advancement and glory of their common country. In strict language, true democracy is never confined to the narrow limits of mere "party struggles." Its struggles are but the developments of truth and principle. Its glory is but the fearless application of great truths to meet the wants and exigencies of a nation. Such a party can never become extinct. As the sun gives all light, and dispels all darkness, whether visible or obscured, so the democratic party when true to its mission presents the cause of truth in such broad and beautiful outlines of duty that no differences seem to divide the public mind, no party divisions are heeded. It is always the same great party, whether honored or dishonored, and men become great in the same degree they become its honest servants.

Pitt was a man of genius, and a democrat. He succeeded, not because he was a man of genius, but because he was true to democracy. Bolingbroke was a man of genius, but he was a Tory, and therefore failed because he was false to humanity. It might seem to a superstitious observer, that Providence was against him. But for the sudden death of Queen Anne,¹ he would probably have been at the head of the Tory party in power, as the Tory high treasurer of England. And but for the unexpected death of the Prince of Wales,—he would have been his chief counsellor, and the foremost among the fathers of the kingdom. How was it, that his great genius, his masterly eloquence, his unsurpassing skill in diplomacy and statesmanship,—did not give life to the Tory party, nor gather and shape the elements of influence to further its plausible and desperate schemes? When men of eminent ability and vast acquirements, such as Wyndham and Murray, who were prepared and ready to follow his lead, and to uphold the Tory policy, and with the possible chance of controlling the crown, it may be said that no man could have more flattering prospects of success, so far as success could be secured by genius, birth, rank and wealth. But all these did not avail him. His motives were those of personal ambition. His policy of

¹ It would almost seem that the issue of this princess was deemed by Providence too central a branch of the Stuart family, to be entrusted with the newly renovated constitution. A more distant connection had already been specially trained for this most important trust, though with little apparent probability of being called to exercise it, the Princess Anne having been no less than seventeen times pregnant.—*George III., Court and Family*, Vol. I, p. 21.

government was but a scheme of arbitrary power. He believed in a party that promised everything, and fulfilled nothing.

To employ the truthful language of Cooke,—“Bolingbroke's life had been a life of slavery to his party. He had joined it when recovering from its prostration under William, and reviving under the warming smile of a Tory queen; he had assisted to revive its spirit, and bore part in the rapid assault by which it had recovered the power and emolument of ministerial rule; he took the lead in the bold counsels, the dark machinations, the unscrupulous deeds by which it attempted to perpetuate its dominion: he shared its prosperity—he was crushed by its fall. Still, while trembling for his life and meditating flight, the grief of his soul was, ‘that he saw the Tory party was gone.’ He had risked and lost his honors and his fortune in its service—he was ready to stake his life. At its command he joined the pretender; and if his sword was not drawn in the rebellion of 1715, it was only because the weight of his influence, at the French court, was more valuable than the service of any single arm. As he espoused, so he quitted the cause of the Stuarts, when he found that success was hopeless, and that the alliance of the pretender was a burden, not a benefit, to his party.” * * * “But the power of his intellect remained, by that he contrived what others should execute: his magic power over the pen was not taken from him, for the spirit of Whiggism forbade the press should be fettered—with this weapon he labored for six and twenty years in the cause of his party. He scrupled at no disguise; he left untried no stratagem to gain for it popularity. He proclaimed it dead, and reproduced it with the mask of patriotism. He allied it with its rival, and declared that all distinctions had ceased: he gained for it a powerful patron, and hoped that he had at last succeeded. But in vain—the mask was torn off, the alliance was repudiated—the patron died. The veteran Tory was disappointed, but not dismayed. Under the weight of accumulated sorrows, bowed down by family bereavements, and racked by excruciating diseases, he continued his service. The hand of death alone arrested the pen of the political pamphleteer.”¹

There is no lesson in history more clearly defined by experience, and confirmed by the wisdom of ages, than is to be found in the maxim, that no schemes of human agency can ever permanently succeed, in violation of the laws of God, or against the common good of mankind.

How the author, just quoted, could trace the career of Bolingbroke with so much accuracy and eloquence, in his vain attempts to succeed against truth and knowledge; and at the same time not be able to discover the obvious sources of Pitt's influence and success, it is difficult to see.² He

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 359.

Thomas Erskine May. He says of Lord

² Similar errors are committed by Sir Chatham:—“Though in outward observ-

had the records of the two great parties before him, and the results of the two great minds of equal genius. One persistently travelled in the hidden and narrow paths of Toryism, and the other in the open high-ways of democracy. One was immortalized by defeat, failure and disappointment; the other by success, and the achievement of a nation's gratitude and a glorious name.

Again, let the reader take a retrospective survey of another period of royalty, the reign of George II., and ask, what are its achievements, and what are the fruits of Toryism? All that was good in George II. emanated from his prejudices in favor of democracy. Even the faith of prejudice, when connected with high motives, proves to be safer than the counsels of party when not based upon principle. The King is not quoted as representing wisdom and intelligence, but as representing royalty. In the elements of success royalty, again, is found wanting. The Tory party, again and again, is seen to be struggling for the ascendancy, on any terms. It is constantly thrown back by its errors, and strangled by its own perfidy. It alternately claims the desperate privileges of oblivion and death in its changes and disguises, and always with ultimate motives to power, but never permanently to reach it. Professedly the right arm of the Church and of the Crown, it has not hesitated to prostitute both when justified by emergencies it could not master. When both utterly failed in means to advance its despotic policy, it declared neutrality both in politics and religion. If the watch-word could not be "Our party," then with amiable condescension it was proclaimed to be "No party." The Church was ready to follow the lead of Bolingbroke, of the King, or the Prince of Wales, though each was false to himself, and all were false to Christianity.

Both King and Church were again saved by the faith and measures of the democratic party. The same trials of the government were passed through, as in former periods, and the same experiments repeated, ending only in failure and taxation. The opponents of democracy, whether in separate

ances a courtier, he was a constitutional statesman, opposed to government by prerogative, and court influence. His career had been due to his own genius: independent of party, and superior to it, he had trusted to his eloquence, his statesmanship, and popularity. And now, by breaking up parties, he hoped to rule over them all. His project, however, completely failed."—*Const. Hist.*, Vol. I, p. 35.

He framed no project to rule,—he pointed to the British Constitution. He broke up no party,—he called a scattered party to

return to its principles. He uttered no language "hoping to rule over all parties." All his utterances, and they were made with the splendid displays of genius and eloquence, were appeals to his countrymen to unite in the democratic faith. "Former little differences must be forgotten," he said, "when the contest is *pro aris et focis*." The people failed in patriotic duty to themselves, to their country, in not giving heed to his call. It was not his failure. The statesman of genius, that speaks the truth, can never fail.

factions, or joined by the treacherous links of coalition, were influenced by the same motives and expedients that had always characterized them,—ending in humiliating defeat and disgrace. Constantly aiming to secure means to consolidate and perpetuate merely a party power, they not only neglected the ordinary and legitimate demands of the government, but regarded all constitutional restraints as obstacles to party loyalty.

Thus, again, for a period of more than a generation are to be found the triumphs of democratic principles and measures. Royalty, in its weakness, imported and compounded with anti-national imbecility; moved by personal antipathies and preferences, and guided by female infidelity, exhausted all its skill and means to master and fulfil its boasted mission,—and finally yielded to a democratic guardianship that the nation might be saved.

Still failing to find the sources of safety, in the direction of public affairs, in hereditary monarchy, the historical student is inclined again to repeat the question, and to pursue the inquiry—whether the successor of George II. gave any evidence of statesmanship that was either superior to that of democracy, or equal to the wants of the nation.

GEORGE III.

It was a propitious period for royalty to have a new start, a new trial, when George III. ascended the throne. The government had been slowly, but surely returned to a constitutional basis, and public affairs were directed by able and responsible statesmen. Party spirit had been tranquillized, and the success of democratic principles again led the Tories to repeat their favorite occasional theory, when powerless, that all political differences had ceased. The British arms had added to the glory of England, and her flag commanded universal respect. The people were proud of their past achievements, and their loyalty gave them a cheerful spirit even under the heavy burdens of taxation. If their late sovereign did not make for himself an enviable personal record, or aid by his counsels the many happy measures and events of his reign, he certainly had some merit in his negative qualities, in not always being obstinate in proportion to his stupidity. If his views were not sufficiently comprehensive to embrace a large policy worthy of England,—he certainly was true in his attachments to Hanover. This attachment was as natural as it was limited. If he could not understand such a man as William Pitt, and his chosen associates,¹ he had

¹ His character is aptly given by Thackeray: not like Fox; he did not like Reynolds; he "Like other dull men, the King was all his did not like Nelson, Chatham, Burke; he life suspicious of superior people. He did was testy at the idea of all innovations, and

prudence enough to give up his favorites when he could not help himself. He was ready to change his ministers, when demanded by the people, particularly when those of his own choice had no power to serve him.¹ If his generation was not distinguished by his own wisdom and acts, it was highly favored by the genius of other men,—in the arts, in literature and science. It has been seen, that royalty does but little to give shape and system to government, and here we have ample evidence that its errors and weakness are not permitted to lessen the sublime ways of Providence.

George Augustus, came to the throne as the successor to his grandfather, inheriting not only the constitutional title to the crown, but succeeding to a condition of things which had been established by democratic statesmanship. It was a mercy added to a blessing to the young King to be permitted to have such a beginning, surrounded as he was, with wise advisers, and by such evidence of prosperity and of national greatness.

With such privileges, however, it was his fearful responsibility to adopt a different policy and to risk new counsellors. He resolved to be more than King, it was his ambition to govern. Not only to govern by the discarded policy of the Stuarts, but to be, as declared by Fox, "his own unadvised minister." Here, too, was another opportunity for the Tory party to bury the past, to obliterate its record of chronic fallacies and presumptuous claims, and to identify itself with a successful democratic faith. But in saying this, the reflective mind is instantly turned to the unsolved question of the prophet Jeremiah,—“Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?” Men and things must be studied as they are. Royalty detached from principle naturally seeks Toryism as an ally. When the prerogatives of the crown are regarded as above the legal requisitions of the constitution, then royalty and the Tory party are one, and their united influence is exerted against democracy. Both had before them the fruits of democracy in the prosperity and content of the people; both had before them the barren fields of Toryism in the exhausted minds of disappointed men whose ambition assumed an offensive guardianship over the rights of the people.

Under such circumstances, it should seem easy to determine what was the course of duty, and difficult to see how ambition or prejudice could pursue a different path. The new sovereign was young and inexperienced, and though respectable in virtue he was not remarkable for capacity. It was his fate early to be placed under the guidance of preceptors who “filled

suspicious of all innovators. He loved mediocrities. He was a dull lad, brought up by narrow-minded people.”—*The Four Georges*, p. 388.

¹ See Holt's *Life of George III.*, Vol. 1, p. 6.

him with predilections more befitting a despot of the Stuart line, than a successor of William III." A liberal course of education was marked out for the young Prince by the Bishops of Norwich and Peterborough,—but set aside by the Earl of Bute, his governor, his early friend and companion.¹ In reply to a question put by Dodington to the Princess Dowager of Wales, "concerning the methods taken by his preceptors, and what they read to him, or made him read: she replied, she really did not well know what they taught him; but to speak freely, she was afraid not much; that they were in the country, and followed their diversions, and not much else, that she could discover; that we must hope it would be better when we came to town." When asked confidentially, what was the Prince's real disposition, she answered,—“You know him, almost as well as I do. He is *very honest*;² but I wish him to be a little more forward and less childish at his age.” At this time he was fifteen.

At the age of seventeen, the Princess of Wales, his mother, thus gave his character:—“He was shy and backward; not a wild, dissipated boy, but good-natured and cheerful, with a serious cast upon the whole; that those about him knew him no more than if they had never seen him. That he was not quick, but with those he was acquainted, appliable and intelligent. His education had given her much pain. His book-learning she was no judge of, though she supposed it small or useless; but she hoped he might have been instructed in the general understanding of things.” When only ten years of age his grandfather sent Baron Stainburg to examine the children of Prince Frederic in their learning. In concluding the examination of Prince George, he said to him, that he would tell the King what a great proficiency his Highness had made in his Latin; but that he wished he would be a little more perfect in his German grammar, as it would be of signal use to him. “German grammar! German grammar,” retorted

¹ A work written by Father Orleans, a Jesuit, was made the manual of the future Sovereign. When his first tutor, Dr. Hayter, Bishop of Norwich, engaged Dr. Tucker to prepare an elementary work on the Principles of Commerce and of Political Economy, the influence of the Earl of Bute frustrated this design, and the worthy Bishop resigned, as did also Lord Harcourt, the Prince's governor. The Bishop of Peterborough was made preceptor to the Prince in 1753.—*Holt's Geo. III.* VOL. I, p. 7.

² “The moment of the new reign,” says Horace Walpole, “afforded a symptom of the Prince's character; of that cool dissimulation in which he had been so well initiated

by his mother. Princess Amalie, as soon as she was certain of her father's death, sent an account of it to the Prince of Wales; but he had already been apprised of it. He was riding, and received a note from a German *valet-de-chambre*, attendant on the late King, with a private mark agreed upon between them, which certified him of the event. Without surprise or emotion, without dropping a word that indicated what had happened, he said his horse was lame, and turned back to Kew. At dismounting he said to the groom, “I have said this horse is lame; I forbid you to say to the contrary.” *Memoirs George III.* VOL. I, p. 16.

the Prince, "why any dull child can learn that." "This witticism," says Holt, "which would have tickled any other man, gave great offence to the old monarch."¹ It was the grandfather's earnest wish that the Prince should marry a niece of the King of Prussia, and he promised him splendid inducements. But when he found it was useless to persuade him, he relinquished the design with the petulant remark,—“that the boy was good for nothing, and only fit to read the Bible to his mother.” In a letter to his son, dated March, 1755, Lord Chesterfield says,—“It is to be hoped, and is most probable, that the King, (George II.) who is now perfectly recovered of his late indisposition, may live to see his grandson of age. He is seriously, a most hopeful boy; gentle and good-natured, with good sound sense.”² In the nursery Lady Hervey spoke of him as “the honestest, truest, most good-natured child that ever lived.” “A singular instance,” says an ungracious writer, “of a child in which a mother, and a Prince in which a courtier, could discover no promise of brilliancy.”

His early education and peculiar surroundings are well stated by Cooke: “George III. was in his twenty-third year when he ascended the throne. His education had not been that which is calculated to form a wise or a popular monarch. His tutors, the Bishop of Salisbury, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Scott were men of sense, learning, and good intentions; but they had little to do with the moulding of the mind of their pupil. This Prince's early youth had been passed in the nursery, amid the adulation of weak women and ignorant pages; and he emerged from this tutelage only to become an instrument in the hands of his mother to work a petty opposition to his grandfather.”³ Being thus continually in the hands of persons whose interest it was to flatter and deceive, we cannot expect to find him possessed of any knowledge of mankind, or evincing any powers of self-control. His character is, nevertheless, a most singular consequence of such an education; and we are rather inclined to wonder at finding him what he was, than disappointed at finding him what we could wish him to have been.” The Earl of Waldegrave, who was familiar with his tastes and peculiarities, thus speaks of him when he was twenty. According to his authority, “he possessed abilities which, although not excellent, wanted only a proper cultivation to be tolerable: he was honest but not generous; religious but not charitable; willing to act justly, but not active to discover

¹ Holt's George III., Vol. I, p. 11.

² Holt's George III., Vol. I, p. 10.

³ Even in the first dawn of the reign—the Tories came to court with all their old prejudices. *Prerogative* became a fashionable word. Party excitement commenced. “Papers were stuck up at the Royal Exchange

and in Westminster Hall, with these words:

“*No Petticoat Government, No Scotch Favorite.* An intemperance which proceeded so far afterwards, that as the King passed in his chair to visit his mother in an evening, the mob asked him if he was going to suck?” *Walpole's Memoirs Geo. III.* Vol. I, p. 21.

what was just ; indifferent to pleasure, but averse to business ; not violent in his resentments, but moody, sullen, and unforgiving towards those who provoked or incurred his displeasure."¹ He describes him as "full of princely prejudices contracted in the nursery, and improved by the society of bed-chamber women and pages of the back-stairs."

If "love does reign in stoutest minds," as Spenser wrote,—it cannot be inconsistent to infer that it is quite as supreme in the weakest. But as in his analysis, he speaks of one pound of gall to every drachm of honey, he evidently referred to the excesses of the passion, and not to the principle. Not unlike his royal predecessors, George III. early discovered that he was not indifferent to "the faith and service" of that passion, which, though seeming so sweet in the bud, too often proves to be quick poison in the flower. At an early age he became fascinated with Hannah Lightfoot, a young and beautiful Quakeress, and it was said and believed by some that they were privately married in 1759. It was also asserted that they lived together, and had children. When her charms lost their freshness, she was married to another with such pecuniary considerations that it was not profitable to be too inquisitive as to particulars. The heart of the youthful Prince was then made captive by the charms of the beautiful Sarah Lenox, and but for the fact that she was a British subject,—he would have led her to the altar. Turned from this fascinating woman by the "stringent statute" that recognizes no dogma of first love, he almost immediately fell in love with Charlotte Sophia, daughter of Charles Lewis, the Duke of Miraw, the second son of the Duke of Mecklenburg Strelitz. She was born in 1744, and though her family was considered by some too insignificant for such high distinction, no state objections were interposed, and the treaty of marriage was signed at Strelitz on the 10th of August, 1761, and the Earl of Hardwicke was commissioned to convey the royal bride to England. This not only proved to be a sensible choice, but great credit was given for high motives in making the selection.²

Such were regarded as the personal characteristics of George III. when he ascended the throne. Here was another and a favorable opportunity

¹ See Hist. of Party, VOL. II, p. 396.

² Her Serene Highness was said to be the delight of the "whole family for the sweetness of the temper, and the quickness of her genius." When she was sixteen—she addressed a letter to the great Frederick of Prussia, congratulating him on his victory at Torgau. She expressed herself with so much elegance and propriety on the bless-

ings of peace, and the ravages of war,—that the young monarch was delighted. He "no sooner perused it, than he exclaimed to Lord Hertford, 'This is the lady whom I shall select for my consort, here are lasting beauties ; the man who has any mind may feast and not be satiated.'"—*Court and Family George III.*, VOL. I, p. 229.

for testing the value of royalty, as connected with a hereditary monarchy. If royalty is a principle to be estimated independently of capacity, then its trial is best seen when not overshadowed by ability, nor disguised by too much knowledge. Such was the King, and the reader must constantly bear in mind,—the extent of his capacity, either for good or evil, in the administration of the government of which he was so long to be the nominal head.

What was such a man capable of doing? Did he become a leader of a party, or by what party was he led? No one claims that he originated a new party, or that he indicated by language or measures a new policy to be adopted. The Whig party was alive in its glory, and that glory was the true life of the nation as exemplified in its government. According to Bolingbroke and other great lights—the Tory party was dead. Its disciples had mourned its death and pronounced its eulogy. In their chastened condition they had professed good will to all men, and had adopted the millennial theory of *no party*. They could tread upon the lion and the adder and receive no harm. All men alike could trust and be intrusted, and do no mischief. All were amiable, honest and happy. But this was the torpor of exhaustion. It was not death. Such is the Tory's temper when out of power. He assumes meekness that he may not be watched, and professes democracy that he may again be trusted. He ceases action only when opportunity fails, but he never dies. He is heir to no such oblivion. The young Prince had been especially educated by the Tories for party purposes, that royalty might be recovered as a party ally. They had succeeded. When it was found that the House of Hanover had produced a Tory King,—“the last hopes of the House of Stuart were destroyed.”¹ The principal Jacobites were satisfied that they had found just as good a Tory in another family, and they cheerfully “went to court.”² “The clergy,” says Buckle, “abandoning the now hopeless cause of the Pretender, displayed the same zeal for the House of Hanover which they had formerly displayed for the House of Stuart. The pulpits resounded with praises of the new King, of his domestic virtues, of his piety, but above all of his dutiful attachment to the English Church. The result was, the establishment of an alliance between the two parties more intimate than any that had been seen in England since the time of Charles I. Under their auspices the old Tory faction rapidly rallied, and were soon able to dispossess their rivals in the management of the government.”³

“It was soon remarked,” says Nicholls,⁴ “that the Pelham party did not

¹ Buckle, Vol. I, p. 318.

² Ibid,—Horace Walpole.

³ Buckle, Vol. I, p. 319.

⁴ Nicholls was a moderate Tory. He was M. P. in the 15th, 16th and 18th Parliaments.

possess the partiality of George III. in the same manner as they had possessed that of George II. ; and the Tories saw with pleasure the removal of that proscription by which they had been so long oppressed. In one word, the nation was intoxicated with loyalty.¹ But those who approached the court more nearly, perceived circumstances which filled them with apprehensions."²

George III. derived his early impressions of government from his mother. She was a woman of superior mind, and had been educated in the court of her father, the Duke of Saxe-Gotha, where she had been accustomed to see unrestrained exercise of the sovereign power,—in a very different way than that she found in England. In Saxe-Gotha sovereignty is property : in Great Britain it is magistracy. A petty German sovereign is not a magistrate ; he is rather the proprietor of the soil and of the inhabitants.³

When the Princess Dowager of Wales came to England, and saw how George II. was controlled by his mistresses and ministers, it was natural that she should have a feeling of surprise, mingled with indignation, in her first experience at a court so imposing, and that she should impress the lesson upon the mind of her son, as she often did :—"George, be King."⁴ Such teachings were certain to have their influence.

It was a subject of national congratulation that the young King was born in England, and his advisers did not omit to supply language recognizing the fact in his first speech to Parliament. He was made to say,—“Born and educated in the country, I glory in the name of Briton.” It was to be expected that such an expression should please the nation, for the House of Brunswick had thus far been particularly unfortunate in its special devotions to Hanover in preference to St. James. This expression was censured by the Earl of Hardwicke, as an insult to the memory of the

¹ Since writing the above, the author has read with pleasure, a book entitled “The Constitutional History of England, Since the Accession of George III.—1760–1860,” a work of ability and historical accuracy, by SIR THOS. ERSKINE MAY. After speaking of circumstances favorable to the crown, he adds : “To these sources of influence must be added the loyalty of the British people. He must indeed be a bad king, whom the people do not love. Equally remarkable are their steady obedience to the law, and respect for authority. Their sympathies are generally on the side of the gov-

ernment. In a good cause their active support may be relied upon ; and even in a bad cause, their prejudices have more often been enlisted in favor of the government, than against it.—VOL. I, p. 5.

² “Recollections, &c.,” VOL. I, p. 3.

³ See Nicholls, VOL. I, pp. 5, 383.

⁴ The King, it was given out, *would* be King, *would not* be dictated to by his ministers, as his grandfather had been. The prerogative was to shine out : great lords must be humbled. — *Walpole's Memoirs George III.*, VOL. I, p. 124.

late King. That it was uttered for political effect, and without sincerity, may be inferred from the fact, that although George III. did not visit Hanover, he sent all his younger sons there to be educated, and he was as much a German in his feeling and policy as ever his grandfather was.

Soon after his accession to the throne, Lord Camden remarked to a friend,—“I see already, that this will be a weak and an inglorious reign.” “What could be expected from a boy,” is the emphatic language of Horace Walpole, “locked up from the converse of mankind, governed by a mother still more retired, who was under the influence of a man that had passed his life in solitude, and was too haughty to admit to his familiarity but half a dozen silly authors and flatterers? Sir Henry Erskine, a military poet, Home, a tragedy-writing parson, and Worsely, a rider of the great horse and architect, were his principal confidants. The nation was soon governed accordingly.”¹ When asked what he thought of the young king, Charles Townshend replied with an obvious impatience,—“He is obstinate.” Selecting as he did Lord Bute as his confidential adviser, and apparently submitting himself to be guided by his proud mother,—he was generally regarded as a weak man. Of this it is difficult to say when it is so easy for men to make a great character out of little or nothing, with motives to accumulating a fictitious influence they design to control.

It was believed by Edmund Burke, that the plan of an interior cabinet, as it was termed, was formed during the lifetime of Frederic, Prince of Wales. “The reign of George III. has from its commencement,” says Nicholls, “exhibited a struggle between the King’s personal wishes, and the opinions of his ostensible ministers. The two first wishes, which he seems to have entertained, were to break down the power of the Pelham faction, and to restore peace. These wishes were judicious. But the instrument, which he employed to effectuate his objects, was unfortunately chosen. The Earl of Bute was not qualified to be a minister. He was removed; and from the time of his removal we may date the establishment of the double cabinet; viz.: secret advisers, and ostensible ministers.”² Where incapacity is the recognized basis of rule, and imposition the source of safety, an interior cabinet becomes a necessity. In other words, to use the language of Lord Chatham, “Where disgrace is prudence, and where it is necessary to be contemptible,”³ those who solely rely upon disguise and management for success,—depend much upon secret preparations. One wrong step may warrant another as an act of prudence; and a right step may be deemed inexpedient if it cannot be consistently followed by others to correspond. Expediency ignores the philosophy of sequences, and what

¹ Memoirs George III., Vol. I, p. 33.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. XXIII, p. 151.

² Nicholl’s Recollections, Vol. I, p. 385.

is planned by cunning may be continued by contrivance. To rely upon the certainty of principle may not always be convenient, and there is but little safety in chance without much practice in its changes.

The Pelham party, sustained by Pitt, was too powerful to be lightly regarded, too well established to be suddenly changed. It was a perilous experiment with whatever motives it might be attempted. Early in 1761, the Duke of Newcastle sent for the Marquis of Rockingham. When he called he found the Duke excited, and ready in his habitual haste to make some communication of consequence. "We have received a message from the King," said he, "of great importance; he wishes that the Earl of Holderness may resign the place of Secretary of State for the Northern Department, and receive in lieu of it the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, and that the Earl of Bute may be appointed Secretary of State for the Northern Department, in place of Earl Holderness." When the subject was discussed the Earl of Hardwicke advised that the wishes of the King should not be opposed. "This was the first instance," said he, "in which the King had interfered in the nomination of ministers; and that resistance to his wishes might excite an ill will which they might afterwards regret." What could be more reasonable? What less could decency suggest, and yet it was opposed by the Marquis of Rockingham, who had the foresight to see that one wrong act might render it necessary to consent to another to preserve consistency. He asked them to consider, whether, "if they admitted, in February 1761, that the Earl of Bute was fit to be Secretary of State, they could say in the following year that he was not fit to be Prime Minister?"¹ The advice of Hardwicke was followed.

The Earl of Bute was appointed, merely to please the King. The King was permitted to do, by consent of his ministers, what they believed to be an error before the appointment, and what he himself found to be after. In the same year Mr. Pitt was removed from office, "and every tool of government employed to run down his character, and destroy his popularity."² What was amusing, "The old Duke of Newcastle was as much rejoiced at the removal of Mr. Pitt as any man."³ He was relieved from the restraints of a superior mind. But, early in the following spring it was the unexpected lot of the Duke himself to be removed, and the Earl of Bute appointed in his place, as First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister.

The reader will distinctly bear in mind that for forty-five years, the Whig party had been in power.⁴ The party had committed errors, and in some degree had tolerated wrongs, as all parties do. On the whole, however, it had made for itself a glorious record. It had advanced the cause of constitutional government, and given to the nation a substantial prosperity. The

¹ Nicholl's Recollections, Vol. I, p. 8.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid, p. 9.

⁴ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 402.

public debt had been increased, it is true, but some of the causes of its increase were of an imperative nature. The true interests of the people were studied and protected.¹ It was a period of practical democracy: where freedom, toleration, commerce, labor and skill were considerately protected and justly rewarded. "In this period," says Hallam, "the seeds of our commercial greatness were gradually ripened. It was evidently the most prosperous season that England had ever experienced; and the progression though slow, being uniform, the reign perhaps of George II. might not be disadvantageously compared for the real happiness of the community with that more brilliant, but uncertain and oscillatory condition which has ensued."² The industrial statistics of Malthus fully confirm this opinion.³ The crown was divested of its power to oppress the subject, and its own safety in the house of Brunswick was firmly established.⁴ War, in defence of constitutional government had asserted principles vital to national life and greatness, and peace had consented to no concessions inconsistent with national honor.⁵ Reforms were accomplished without the excesses of fanaticism,—and if corruption placed its foul hands on the faithful servants of the government, it was controlled as an enemy, but not recognized as an ally.⁶ Diplomacy succeeded only when placed in able and honest hands, and if legislative wisdom was not brave enough to proclaim edicts of religious toleration, public opinion, sustained and purified by a democratic atmosphere, demanded and secured a tolerant practice. The freedom of the press was regarded as of vital importance to a constitutional government, in view of its future growth and continued life, and the cause of personal liberty was deemed the cause of public safety.⁷ Even the King, himself, and the Parliament were not above the sacred requisitions of the law, and legal rights and privileges were not denied to the vilest and meanest subjects.

In the person of John Wilkes, democracy had the power to move the nation, and to excite the world.⁸ He knew its strength and safety, though

¹ In 1714 the public debt was £54,145, 868, bearing an interest of £3,351,858. Upon the close of the war in 1762, it amounted to £146,683,844, bearing an interest of £4,840,821. The difference in the rates of interest shows how rapid was the improvement in the public credit. See the "History of the National Debt," and Sir John Sinclair's "History of the Revenue." *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 408.

² *Const. Hist.* Vol. III, p. 401.

³ Malthus *Polit. Econ.* p. 279. Ccoke, Vol. II, p. 417.

⁴ Locke, quoted by Cooke, Vol. II, p. 412.

⁵ *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. xv, p. 1274.

⁶ *Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 414.

⁷ In 1788 a member of the House of Commons complained, that "the stuff which our weekly newspapers are filled with is received with greater reverence than acts of Parliament; and the sentiments of one of those scribblers had more weight *with the multitude* than the opinion of the best politician in the Kingdom." *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. x, p. 448.

⁸ John Wilkes was the second son of a wealthy distiller living in St. John's Square, Clerkenwell, but descended of a family of

he may not have always honored its principles by pure motives and consistent practice. The cry of "Wilkes and Liberty" did not make liberty responsible for the sins of Wilkes, but it gave him distinction inasmuch as he became the representative of freedom. If he doomed his own soul to the degrading slavery of his lusts and passions, let him be remembered as the brave soldier who was willing to battle against tyranny in the great cause of liberty. If the forty-fifth number of "North Briton" was condemned by the King and Parliament to be burnt as seditious, and against the peace of society, it was because the author had no personal motives to

that name long settled in Buckinghamshire. He was born in October, 1730. As he early discovered superior ability, his father bestowed much care upon his education. He graduated with honor, and contracted friendships with many men eminent for their genius and learning. Gibbon, who passed an evening with him in 1762, when both were militia officers, says: "I scarcely ever met with a better companion; he has inexhaustible spirits, infinite wit and humor, and a great deal of knowledge." That he was a profligate he did not deny himself. He was elected several times member of the House of Commons, and expelled; made an Alderman and Lord Mayor, and he filled other offices; he was prosecuted for libel, sent to the Tower, declared an outlaw, and though not claiming for himself much goodness or wisdom,—he was the means of much discussion on the great principles of freedom. "The proceedings relative to Mr. Wilkes," says Bisset, "during the year 1763, occupied the principal attention of the whole nation. The popular party represented him as the champion of liberty, and the object of persecution on account of his patriotism. Every publication of which he was the subject, was read with astonishing avidity. Not the populace merely, but men of real talents and virtue, though they detested his profligacy, considering the freedom of Englishmen as violated in his person, associated the idea of 'Wilkes and Liberty.'" .

After quoting the opinions of Gibbon, and saying that he considered his language "greatly exaggerated," Lord Brougham gives some amusing examples of his wit,

and speaks of his undaunted courage. He says, "Neither politically nor personally did he know what fear was. Into no risks for his party did he ever hesitate to rush. From no danger individually was he ever known to shrink." When coarsely asked by Lord Sandwich, "Whether he thought he should die by a halter or by a certain disease?" he quickly said,—“That depends on whether I embrace your Lordships principles or your mistress.”

A "powerfully humorous" dialogue is given by Lord Brougham, on the authority of the Duke of Norfolk, which took place between Wilkes and Lord Thurlow, in the House of Lords, some years before the French Revolution: "When that consummate piece of cant was performed with all the solemnity which the actor's incredible air, eye-brows, voice, could lend the imprecation:—"

Lord Thurlow,—"If I forget my sovereign, may my God forget me!"

"*Wilkes*, seated on the steps of the throne, eying him askance with his inhuman squint and demoniac grin, muttered, 'Forget you! He'll see you d——d first.'"—*Eminent Statesmen*, Vol. II, p. 288. The name of Wilkes became so identified with the cause of freedom,—the people of the United States gave his name to several towns and counties. In a township of Pennsylvania—the people were divided as to the comparative merits of Wilkes and Col. Barre,—and they compromised by uniting the two names—and they called it *Wilkesbarre*. It remains unchanged.

be prudent for himself, and was willing to proclaim unwelcome truths to those in power for the public good. If his motives were selfish, or unworthy, he had the merit of doing good to others, while he was false to himself. If he was willing to identify himself with an obscene "Essay on Woman," and the questionable practices of the "Mock Monks Club," it was not so much his design to encourage and perpetuate what was detestable and blasphemous in sentiment, as to rebuke the cant and hypocrisy of those who were his companions in sin, and yet professed to be saints before the world. His sedition helped to remove Lord Bute from the office he had disgraced. His boldness, in claiming to be the champion of freedom gave courage to worthy men of unexceptionable lives to follow his examples of open and undisguised acts of patriotic duty. Whatever may be said of John Wilkes, all will admit, that he was strong only when he was true to principle, and like other men, weak, whenever he was false. When good men do bad things, it is from ignorance; but when bad men do good things, their conceptions of knowledge are above their sense of duty. Their choice of means is a compliment to virtue. Their conduct is more beneficent to the world than selfish to themselves.

These things, and this condition of things, are to be remembered in this connection, especially, that we may be enabled to see the vast difference between the doings of the Whig and Tory parties. The King was not placed upon the throne by any political party. The crown was his constitutional inheritance, made so by act of parliament. By legislation, he was the King of the people, but not of a party. But, like other men, he had his weaknesses, and was influenced by his passions and prejudices, and had been taught to believe that as his grandfather was a Whig, it was his duty to be a Tory. This was the logic of hate, and there was nothing in royalty to abate its force, or to guide its application. He did not hesitate an instant to give his entire confidence to the Tory party, and proscribe the Whigs. As soon as possible he displaced them. He became the nominal leader of a party he was willing to trust, for private reasons, but which as connected with public duty, he was unable to comprehend. 'An ignorant King without statesmanship, or an intelligent Prince without integrity, is an uncertain servant, and a dangerous master.

If George III. was entitled to confidence, on account of his private virtues, so rare within the precincts of royalty,—his grandfather was entitled to still greater confidence for his foresight in respect to public policy. Both were partisans, by education, but neither was a statesman. What was accomplished by George II. by the aid of the Whig party, has been seen. What was done by George III., by the aid of the Tory party, remains to be stated. "Men, not measures," is regarded by some as a safe maxim. With a statesman of comprehensive views, both *men and measures*, would prove to be a more useful truth, and indicate a more practical course

of duty. In the choice of advisers, the errors of George II. were committed by himself, and corrected by his party, the party of principle. The errors of George III. were committed by the influence of his party, the party of privilege and prerogative. In the one case the errors were repelled by a party faith founded on experience; in the other, they were adopted by a party sympathy stimulated by arbitrary power. The one succeeded because its designs were right and practicable. The other failed because its plans were wrong, and therefore impossible. Both commenced by committing the same error, by selecting an incapable minister, and both were influenced by a woman. One on the line of duty, the other against it. George II. was persuaded by his queen that Compton was not the right man, and that Walpole was. George III. was led by his mother to believe that no man could serve him so faithfully as Lord Bute.¹ The one was influenced to correct his error, and to do right; the other was required to do wrong, and not to alter.

The duties imposed upon himself by George III. were both difficult and dangerous. His programme of a cabinet embraced a double wrong: to displace able men, who had succeeded, and to appoint inferior men of a party who had always failed.² He adopted the Tory fallacy of trusting men who had no sense of duty above obedience, no appreciation of power but in selfish and personal rewards.³ He saw the minister in the courtier—

¹ Walpole's *George III.*, Vol. I, p. 15.

² Cooke says,—“There is no reason to suppose that the individuals of one party were superior to those of the other (we will except Pitt). But the ambition of avarice of the Whigs were restrained by the principle of their party. Many men who have little real piety assume its semblance, in order to conform to their particular sect. Whiggism imposes a similar obligation; a man who enrols himself among that faction (party?) must at least speak and act as if he were a patriot.”—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 424. This language is unjust. Not only to men of questionable character, but to men who are entitled to be ranked with Pitt. Hypocrites are to be found in all classes. The hypocrite who prefers to act with the good and patriotic,—is certainly superior to the hypocrite who chooses to act with men of an opposite character.

³ The Tory party—that does not hesitate to usurp authority when deemed necessary to protect itself, seldom fails to exercise in

the fullest degree the legal power of removal and appointment for party reasons. In speaking of the sudden dismissal of some of the most distinguished statesmen from office, Sir Thomas Erskine May says,—“Nor was the vengeance of the court confined to the heads of the Whig party. Not only were all placemen, who had voted against the preliminaries of peace, dismissed: but their humble friends and clients were also proscribed. Clerks were removed from public offices, and inferior officers from the customs and excise, and other small appointments, for no other offence than that of having been appointed by their obnoxious patrons. While bribes were lavished to purchase adhesion to the court policy, the King and his advisers determined to discourage opposition with unsparing severity. Great lords must be humbled, parties overborne, and Parliament reduced to subjection.”—*Const. Hist. G. B.*, Vol. I, p. 21.

that creature denominated by the Bard of Avon, more than three hundred years ago, "the caterpillar of the commonwealth." He saw the statesman in the "*favorite*," of whom "it has been remarked," said Burke, "that there is no prince so bad whose *favorites* and ministers are not worse." He saw the legislator in the partisan, whose loyalty changes its face as often as fortune turns its wheel and withholds its gifts. He saw the Parliament in the Tory party, whose "weary labyrinths" of crafty management and proud perversity, like odious weeds in the choicest garden, outlive the productive plants they spring up to choke. His ambition, as the born representative of royalty, was as much above his capacity to reach, as his conceptions of duty were below the highest standard of statesmanship. From nothing to nothing it is difficult to measure. From something to nothing is difficult to understand. He assumed to be the chief of a party he had not the ability to lead. As its nominal head, he could not hope to control it, unless it were reduced to his level by the appointment of abject partisans and inferior ministers. A headless party is a blind monster. It has no consciousness of purpose but to devour, no plan of direction but for prey. The ultimate fate of such a party is like that of a shapeless raft upon the water, seized by adventurous thieves for its value, but who are powerless to guide or to save it. It floats with the prevailing stream, and by its ponderous gravity damages whatever it touches. It is turned, or dragged, or stopped by snags, or unyielding rocks, until it is broken into fragments, and its lawless wreckers are seen desperately competing for the ruins.

To decide upon such a man as Lord Bute for minister was equivalent to a dismissal of Pitt. His disqualifications were antagonistic to capacity and character. The strength of the one was fatal to the existence of the other. Neither Bute nor the King comprehended the conditions necessary to the life of the Tory party. To secure its continued ascendancy was their sole purpose. Both were still more ignorant of the Whig party, whose rule they had been taught to oppose. Both were party men, and of the same party, and yet neither was able to mark out the policy of the one or to comprehend the duties of the other. Their personal wishes characterized their measures, and the Tories conformed to them. Not because they represented any principle of the constitution, but because they represented a party. Here was a chance government, and a chance party, to succeed a party whose outlines of duty had been defined for centuries, and a government that had long been guided by the wise maxims of a constitution. Royalty was fettered by a party it was to lead, and the fettered monarch was made the leader of the party he proposed to follow. Thus both government and party were without acknowledged leaders, and yet both party and government were confined to the narrow channel of Lord Bute's mind—the *favorite* of the King, the head of an "interior cabinet."

Bute had the negative merit of not concealing his contempt for the popular voice, and it was not singular that, though loved by the King, he was detested by the people.¹ He was a handsome man, and the reputed lover of the king's mother. Through her influence at an early period, it was believed, he became the royal favorite. He was a Scotchman. This was a misfortune in England at this time. In addition to the arbitrary qualities of a Tory, he was in his manners cold, haughty, reserved and unconciliating.² He was easily deluded into the flattering belief that the friendship of the King would qualify him to be a popular minister. What could not be done by personal appliances was attempted by chicanery and questionable influences. To use the language of Horace Walpole, he was moved by the hallucinations of "lofty ignorance," and satisfied in the belief that "distance and obscurity are sufficient characteristics of divinity."³ He was ready to promise, affirm, insinuate, or deny, whatever seemed to be necessary for the moment. Fear of consequences, such as are sure to follow acts of duplicity or perfidy, seldom disturbed his senseless equanimity. He "carried the King's ministers to market in his pocket," is the humorous remark of Lord Hardwicke;⁴ and he congratulated himself that he was prepared for any emergency. He was self-reliant as to party, though he had taken no part in politics. He had been associated with no politicians or influential families. By virtue of his personal relations with the King, he assumed to be general minister:⁵ to make peace on the basis of policy;⁶

¹ On Lord Mayor's day, 1761, it was said that Pitt was in the procession of the triumphal entry into the city. The people crowded to do him honor with their shouts. "But, on the east side of St. Paul's Churchyard, some knowing hand stepped up, and looking full at the idol, pronounced, with a fine, hoarse, audible voice,—'By G—d, this is not Pitt; this is Bute, and be damned to him.' Upon this, the tide took another turn; and the bruisers' lungs being worn out, the shouts from the independent mobility were instantly converted into hisses, accompanied with a few vulgar sayings, as 'D——n all Scotch rogues!'—'No Bute!' 'No Newcastle salmon!'—'Pitt forever!'"—*Chatham Cor.*, Vol. II, p. 166.

² Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 980.

³ Memoirs George III., Vol. I, p. 144.

⁴ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 1330.

⁵ "Many of the Whigs," says Cooke, "who still remained in the cabinet, thought that the dismissal of Pitt had been in a

great degree their work, and considered that it had been provoked by his assumption of too great authority. They soon, however, discovered their error. The Earl of Bute became as absolute as Pitt had been; invaded their departments, corrupted their secretaries, and established secret correspondences. He acted on the principle that they were only responsible to the King, and he was the King's agent to declare his pleasure."—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 405. See *Hist. of the Minority, Chesterfield's Characters*.

⁶ The King's speech to his Council was drawn up by Lord Bute, and communicated to none of the King's servants. It afforded an early specimen of who was to be the confidential minister, and what measures were to be pursued. "It talked of a bloody and expensive war, and of obtaining an honorable and lasting peace. Thus was it delivered; but Mr. Pitt went to Lord Bute that evening, and after an altercation of three

to propose taxes oppressive to the people ;¹ to guard the King's honor and redeem his questionable promises ; to stand between the King and his subjects ; to stipulate quarrels as preliminary to removals ;² to gratify servile retainers ; to dictate army appointments—and, in fact, to do anything required by the government. Provided, however, the government demanded nothing adverse to the party he desired to revive in order to control, and provided his party quietly submitted to his will and dictation. His course excited general disgust. The people hated him, and it was deemed unsafe for him to show himself in public. His administration was derided as “the petticoat government,”³ and his measure for protecting the interests

hours, prevailed that in the printed copy the words should be changed to *an expensive but just and necessary war*; and, that after the words *honorable peace* should be inserted, *in concert with our allies*. Lord Mansfield and others counselled these palliatives too; but it was two o'clock of the following afternoon before the King would yield to the alteration.”—*Walpole's George III.*, Vol. 1, p. 17.

¹ Before the King had completed the fourth month of his reign, the unpopular tax of one-half penny a pot on beer was imputed to Lord Bute. On the establishment of peace, the ministry resolved to avoid taxation as much as possible. The supplies were to be raised, first, by taking two millions of the sinking fund; secondly, by striking one million eight hundred thousand pounds in exchequer bills; thirdly, by borrowing two millions eight hundred thousand on annuities; and, lastly, by two lotteries, for three hundred and fifty thousand pounds each. To pay the interest on these loans, an additional duty was imposed upon all wines of the growth of France, and in an inferior degree on all other wines. Another duty was added, which excited a ferment in the nation, viz:—four shillings per hogshead upon cider, to be paid by the maker, collected by the officers, and subjected to all the laws of excise.—*Holt's Life of George III.*, Vol. 1, pp. 25, 102. In the cider counties they dressed up a figure in Scotch plaid, with a blue riband, to represent the favorite, and this figure seemed to lead by the nose an ass royally crowned. Horace Walpole thus speaks of

Sir Francis Dashwood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer:—“Hitherto he had but just acted enough as minister, to show that he neither was one nor was fit to be one. The time was now come for *opening the budget*, when it was incumbent on him to state the finances, debts, and calls of government; and to chalk out a plan of proper supplies. All this he performed so awkwardly, with so little intelligence or clearness, in so vulgar a tone, and in such mean language, that he, who had been esteemed a plain country gentleman of good sense, said himself afterwards,—‘People will point at me, and cry, *there goes the worst Chancellor of the Exchequer that ever appeared!*’ His famous measure was the tax on cider.” *Memoirs of George III.*, Vol. 1, p. 152.

² Pitt became aware that a desperate cabal was already formed by Bute, for the purpose of changing the whole policy of the administration; by which means he himself would be precipitated from power, and the glory of the nation tarnished and obscured. Nor was this disagreeable apprehension long in being realized. Lord Bute soon informed his friend Doddington, that Lord Holderness, then a member of the Pitt cabinet, had agreed to quarrel with his associates and resign.—*Smucker's Four Georges*, p. 181.

³ During Bute's administration, public caricatures, libels and pasquinades had been carried to an extreme audacity which had never before been seen in England. The uniform symbol by which he was known and ridiculed was a great jack-boot, which was usually accompanied by a petti-

of the people were held in such profound contempt, the word "*economy*," clothed in all its imposing dictionary innocence, was publicly hissed from the stage.¹

Of course, Lord Bute had his servile and fawning admirers, as all officials have. Some of them were distinguished men. Providence seems to favor the groping disciples of error, weakness and absurdity, by gleams of intelligence, so that no part of humanity may wander beyond the cheering call of wisdom and of love. Every party, or sect, however small, has some one or more, above its level, to think and guide; to strengthen and to lift it up; to lead and go on. This is divine beneficence. By this bountiful provision, to borrow an agricultural term, the useless swamps and quagmires of the moral world are recovered and utilized.

Dr. Smollett not only wrote "a highly wrought panegyric" on Bute, but gave it an artist's dark shade by abusing Pitt.² "His partisans," says Bisset, "have praised the tenacity of Lord Bute in his purposes, a quality which, guided by wisdom in the pursuit of right objects, and combined with power to render success ultimately probable, is magnanimous firmness; but without these requisites, is stubborn obstinacy."³

Tenacity of purpose implies intelligent motives, deliberate reflection, and an ultimate judgment. These are characteristics of foresight, knowledge and wisdom. Nothing can be more sickening or discouraging to an honest man of intelligence than the contemplation of "the learned pate ducking to the golden fool," and of the veteran slave of ambition, who is ready to bow to the empty forms of greatness, and to cringe at the feet of weak and irresponsible authority. Where mind is wanting, the passions rule. Where duty is not followed, truth becomes offensive. Truth and duty are obstacles to mere partisans. In the removal of Legge, the chancellor of the exchequer, there was both malice and fear. He was an uncompromising Whig, a zealous supporter of Pitt, and had avowed his unalterable confidence in democracy.⁴ These facts afforded ample grounds for dismissal, but his doom was made certain when it appeared that he was personally offensive to the King, and had given offence to one of Lord Bute's relations seven years before. Revenge was too sweet to be easily given up when the dangers of duty could be removed by one and the same act.

coat; and these were often hung upon a gallows, or consigned to the flames. The names of the monarch, of his amorous mother, of her favorite minister, and of his chief supporters were boldly and unscrupulously appended to the most abusive and offensive strictures.—*Dr. Smucker's Four*

Georges, p. 195. See "*Wright's History of England under the House of Hanover*," Vol. I, *passim*.

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 1333.

² Hist. of Party, Vol. III.

³ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 1326.

⁴ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 370.

Legge was succeeded by Sir Francis Dashwood, "a man," it had been said, "to whom a sum of five figures was an impenetrable secret."¹

Horace Walpole says,—“The late Prince of Wales, growing tired of Lord Bute, said to him,—‘Bute, you would make an excellent ambassador in some proud little court where there is nothing to do.’”² But for its charity, this would have been a keen compliment for his lordship. And yet, with such a man before him, and Pitt and other master spirits constantly affording him ample opportunities for comparison, the King suddenly sent orders to Lord Holderness to give up the seals of the Secretary of State, adding in conversation, “that he had two secretaries, one (Mr. Pitt) who would do nothing, and the other (Lord Holderness) who could do nothing; he would have one, who both could and would.”³ This was Lord Bute. It seems sometimes to be almost like a joke, to see small minds aiming at great things, when small ones are beyond the reach of their capacity. There can be no law against endeavor, although there may be impassable limits to necessity. On the other hand, there is an instinctive magnanimity in great minds when dealing with small ones. This is believed to be true of animals, as size is an essential condition of defence and attack. This is no chance provision of nature, for were it otherwise, companionship of mental exertion would be impracticable. This was the lofty feeling of Pitt, just so long as he had hopes that he could save his country by aiding the government. In no sense can greatness be humiliated by duty. Greatness ceases when duty is surrendered to ignorance, or when it is subordinated to crime, or to selfish ends. In addition to his intense feeling of loyalty, and devotion to the crown, he was conscious of surpassing ability to serve the nation. He scorned to notice the petty animosities and jealousies of politicians, of either party, so long as they did not go below the surface of things, and indulged in innocent personalities. Though they were doing but little good, they were doing no serious harm. Their mischief seldom had the merit of any quality above that of unintentional neglect of duty. They simply stood in the way of abler and better men. It is true the government did not stop, but its continued vitality was one of those mysteries of Providence which time may remove, but which no man, with prescient power, can solve. Perhaps, as a vacuum finds a useful place in machinery, it may have an allotted place in mind. Surely, the wrath of man shall praise the Lord,—and in this declaration consolation is always to be found in the walks of poverty, whether in the barren places of thought or of possession.

With all the austere qualities of Pitt, which marked his course as a public

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs George III.*, Vol. I, p. 109.

² Walpole's *Memoirs George III.*, Vol. I, p. 179.

³ *Ibid*, p. 36.

man, he never compromised the dignity of duty, or sacrificed public interests by neglect. He was always ready to act, when action was a propriety. Because others were incapable and therefore inactive, was no reason why he should withhold his counsel when asked by the King, even if it was not appreciated, and he was personally disliked. With him, others could do but little except to follow; and it was a striking example of human feebleness that Bute was appointed to assume control where he would be lost even with a guide. When Pitt saw the cabinet yielding to the prerogative power and guided by Tory influence; when he saw great questions of state discussed with an earnest endeavor, but decided in accordance with secret and premeditated schemes; when he became satisfied that it was his outward popularity, and not his wisdom they wanted, and that his influence was used to subvert the principles of democracy, and in violation of the constitution, he did not hesitate to resign. "He thanked the ministers of the late King for their support; said he was himself called to the ministry by the voice of the people, to whom he considered himself as accountable for his conduct; and that he should no longer remain in a situation which made him responsible for measures he was no longer allowed to guide." Lord Granville, who was still president of the council, replied to this declaration. "I find," said he, "the gentleman is determined to leave us; nor can I say I am sorry for it, since he would otherwise have certainly compelled us to leave him; but if he be resolved to assume the right of advising his majesty, and directing the operations of the war, to what purpose are we called to this council? When he talks of being responsible to the people, he talks the language of the House of Commons, and forgets that at this board he is only responsible to the King."¹

Such was the language of a Tory in reply to a democratic speech of Pitt. It would have been more decent if it had been uttered by one who was entitled to respect. From Granville it inspired no sense of duty. And yet, he truly represented his party. He looked to the King, but cared nothing for the people. "What can be more conclusive," says Cooke, "as evidence that the Tory spirit had gained an ascendancy in the Cabinet, than the contrast between these two speeches. Pitt avows himself a minister created by, and dependent upon, the people; Granville boasts that he is responsible only to his King: the Whig is driven from the council—the Tory remains. Pitt received, upon his retirement, a pension of £3,000 a year for three lives, and a title for his lady. No man

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 404.

The resignation of Pitt was regarded as a national calamity. Soon after, the King dined at the Guildhall. It was the Lord Mayor's Day. The monarch, his young

bride, and his cabinet, were scarcely noticed; while Pitt's entrance was greeted by long and loud acclamations.—*Dr. Smucker*, p. 186.

was ever more absolutely entitled to the recompense he now received."¹

Pitt was soon followed in his retirement by Earl Temple, Duke of Newcastle,² and Duke of Devonshire.³ All Whigs, who refused to deny their principles, were removed, and their places filled with Tories. The party in power knew its own weakness, its odious reputation, and publicly acknowledged it by indirectly attempting to change its name. They wanted no additional evidence that it was hateful to the people. The new name was apparently modest and unpretending, and yet its narrow pretence conveyed much meaning. To be called "the King's friends," was a double admission of wrong. It was placing personal relations above those of citizenship, and erecting a private rather than a public standard of duty. Thus, the broad and general views of the King, as made known in his proclamations against vice, and in favor of virtue, culminated in a narrow faction of the Tory party. As it became all Tory, and followed an administration that was all Whig, it is easy to note the difference between the two,—to see what they proposed to do, and could not, and what they promised to perform, and did not. Their professions of strength ended in weakness, and their profound convictions of duty in the necessity of reform and economy, in corruption. It was an extraordinary example of weakness brought in proximity with that of strength. The two parties were placed in contrast.

For a time the government was carried forward upon the track upon which Pitt had placed it. The Whigs were gradually retired from official position, and the party was slow to discover the extent of the schemes of projected change. The necessity of an organized opposition was not readily seen. Besides, it was not an easy matter to turn the Whigs against the house of Brunswick. The throne had been established by them on the

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. II, p. 405. "In thirteen months," says Sir Thomas Erskine May, "he had been groom of the stole, a privy councillor, ranger of Richmond Park, Secretary of State, and Premier; and these favors were soon followed by his installation as a Knight of the Garter, at the same time as the King's own brother, Prince William."—*Const. Hist. G. B.*, Vol. I, p. 19.

² The Duke acquainted the King (May 14, 1762) that he would resign, who answered coldly,—“Then, my lord, I must fill up your place as well as I can.” Lord Bute had the ill-natured arrogance to compliment him on his retirement: the Duke replied with spirit that marked his lasting

ambition,—“Yes, yes, my lord, I am an old man; but yesterday was my birth-day, and I recollected that Cardinal Fleury began to be prime minister of France just at my age.”—*Walpole's George III.*, Vol. I, p. 107. A pension was proposed, but it was promptly declined by the Duke.

³ The Duke of Devonshire was removed from all his employments which depended upon the crown. This attack upon a nobleman who was undistinguished by ambition or party violence, only to be accounted for by the circumstances of his being the representative of an illustrious Whig family, denoted the sweeping policy of the new premier.—*Hist. of Party*, Vol. II, p. 406.

democratic basis of the Revolution, and they were not prepared to find a Tory in the descendant of a Democrat, who was the acknowledged representative of the Protestant succession. By slow degrees, however, they were compelled to witness events which they had not anticipated. The people were startled and alarmed at changes which no sound judgment could have predicted. Measures were adopted which indicated an ignorance and recklessness totally inconsistent even with party prudence. The Commons sustained the ministers in their fluctuating movements, and voted against the great statesman of the age when he was no longer minister.¹ Peace was made when war was impossible, for the want of means,² and treaties modified or violated for want of wisdom to execute them without dishonor.³ Favoritism commenced its withering process of quick congestion, and placed the young King in the complicated and bewildering mazes of error. He was involved in obligations which he could not fulfil, and be true to the constitution,—and which he could not violate without personal treachery. Principle was not permitted to raise its standard, nor wisdom to denote its action. Party, assuming power, not for the good it consciously designed to do, but for the sole privileges of unlicensed authority,—essayed aimless flights on pinions that had been clipped, or dislocated for centuries, and lighted upon broken and decayed limbs that were falling without the force of additional weight. The ground was too solid and immovable to rest upon. Unchangeable identity and locality were fatal to continued safety.

The favorite, with an alarming sense of incapacity to preserve the confidence of the King, if he attempted statesmanship with his superiors, suddenly resigned.⁴ Whether he resigned with motives to duty, to give up what he was unable to accomplish; or to evade what he could not understand; whether he was impelled by a pride that was superior to his wisdom, to avoid humiliating results beyond his courage to bear, or to please the King who may have thought he should lose the friend if he attempted to save the minister,—it is quite unnecessary to decide. He had the full benefit of all such conjectures, not only from his enemies but from his friends.⁵ Though he gave his reasons with an apparent candor and self-

¹ Hist. of Party, Vol. III, p. 21.

² Ibid, p. 19.

³ Ibid, p. 17.

⁴ See Walpole's George III., Vol. I, p. 88. Also, Correspondence of Pitt, Vol. II, p. 218.

⁵ George Grenville was Bute's successor. He had been a Whig. Lords Egremont and Halifax continued secretaries of state. Fox continued as paymaster of the forces,

and was raised to the upper house, by the title of Baron Holland. Sir Francis Dashwood, on resigning the chancellorship, was created Baron le Despencer. The Earl of Sandwich, who possessed neither popularity, ability or virtue, was made first lord of the admiralty. If we were to believe the title of what is alleged in the *North Briton's* notes to the poems of Churchill, against Lord le Despencer and others, we

abasement, but few gave him credit for sincerity. "Having," said he, "restored peace to the world, performed his engagements, and established a connection so strong as no longer to need his assistance, he would now depart to the domestic and literary retirement which he loved."¹ This was the language of pride and party, addressed to those whose interests warped them to believe him. Before he retired, in a letter to one of his friends, he said: "Single, in a cabinet of my own forming; no aid in the House of Lords to support me, except two peers [Lords Denbigh and Pomfret]; both of the secretaries of state silent, and the lord chief justice, whom I myself brought into office, voting for me, yet speaking against me; the ground I tread upon is so hollow, that I am afraid, not only of falling myself, but of involving my royal master in my ruin. It is time for me to retire."² This, indeed, appeared to be the language of integrity, and it was probably addressed to one he had no motive to influence, or if he had, over whom he had no power, but the power of knowledge.

When Pitt resigned, it was said that he went out "carrying the Earl of Bute upon his back, and sinking under his burden." This was represented in caricatures of the time.³ There was doubtless some truth in this assertion. It was believed by some that the plans of Bute were known to Pitt. After his resignation, it was well known to all that he was the first to make an appeal to Pitt to strengthen the cabinet and to save the government. He saw that a weak King and an ignorant minister, with such as they had invited to participate in the direction of public affairs, were really incapable of protecting the nation in its varied wants and interests. If Lord Bute, in his own person, afforded an example of inefficiency in public affairs, it is certainly creditable to his ordinary judgment that he was so graciously prepared to retire. It was natural for him to prefer to negotiate with such a man as Pitt, who had no equal, than to seek aid from others of his own class, and who were universally known to be the inferiors of the great statesman. By doing this, he gave character to his resignation. In no other way could he act so wisely—for while he was publicly striving to place the government in the ablest hands, he was indirectly conciliating his enemies. They, having lost all respect for the retiring minister, could but approve his disposition to negotiate a union between a king they had good reasons for not trusting, with the only statesman they were willing to trust. It is true, by doing this, Lord Bute was false to his

must believe that most of the public men of this time were, in private life, monsters. *of the Minority*, and other pamphlets of the day.

The profligacy of the Earl of Sandwich and Lord le Despencer is proved by a concurrence of contemporary testimony. See *Hist. of Party*, VOL. III, p. 26, and *Hist.*

¹ Parl. Deb., VOL. XV, p. 1826.

² Ibid, p. 1821.

³ *Hist. of Party*, VOL. II, p. 408.

party. But, how could he do otherwise without additional disgrace? He had exhausted his own means, as a Tory, and the means of his party, in serving the King. As he still enjoyed the confidence of his royal master, what could he do that would be so likely to redeem him in the public estimation, as to secure the coöperation of a statesman of unquestionable ability to save the government from ruin? The Tories, who had reputations to lose, were unwilling to accept places in a cabinet formed by him, and he could see no safety, either for the throne or himself, in a new ministry no better qualified to meet the wants and exigences of the nation than the retiring one.

Though according to the record, he first approached Pitt to ascertain his willingness to meet the King, still it is probable that the interview was not without the royal assent. It was creditable to Lord Bute that he submitted to a necessity with grace and promptness. The Tory party had failed. He saw no escape from painful responsibility but in the entire transfer of public affairs to Democratic hands. It was a bold, but honorable movement for a partisan to make, if made from sincere convictions of duty. If he hoped to control by complimenting Pitt, and by indirect management and royal influence, to gain an advantage for the Tories, he soon found his mistake. Toryism and Democracy can never mix. Their elements are antagonistic: any surrender of the one to the other is fatal to both.

This principle was well understood by Pitt. When asked to carry out Tory measures by Democratic means, or Democratic measures by Tory means, he did not hesitate to decline any such impossible endeavor. Democrats cease to be Democrats the moment they attempt to be moderate Tories, or no-party men. When Tories profess Democracy, they are generally impostors. *Neutrality* in matters of principle is a crime, and *party*, in matters of practice, is a duty. Not party directed to particular or selfish ends, but to the general good. "No man can serve two masters." Instead of connecting his honor with the duties of the crown, and regarding the crown as the constitutional head of the government, professedly and really instituted for the general welfare of the people, the King confounded his personal honor with his official obligations. His oath of office was forgotten. Magistracy is impersonal. The honor of the man is merged in the obligations of the public servant.¹ Service to the people implies integrity in practice. Impartial justice is alike due to all. Government cannot stand on a narrower basis. Both the King and Lord Bute were obviously impressed with the grave emergencies of the nation, and with the fearful

¹ This subject is well expressed in Addison's Cato:—

"Honor's a sacred tie—the law of Kings,

The noble mind's distinguishing perfection,
That aids and strengthens virtue where it meets her,
And imitates her actions where she is not:
It is not to be sported with."

necessity of change of men and measures. They turned from the miserable dependencies which promised everything and yielded nothing,—because they could master them any way. They had strength and wisdom before them,—but these they feared. The King wanted the power of Pitt without his party, and Bute wanted the aid of all parties but without the principle of any.

The substance of the interview between Lord Bute and Pitt, and of Pitt's conference with the King, is given in a letter of Earl Hardwicke to his son, Lord Royston. It is dated Sept. 4th, 1763. The instincts of Lord Bute were in advance of his discretion, for at first he asked through the Lord Mayor for a private interview with Pitt "at some third place." But when he reflected upon the out-spoken character of Pitt, and that his policy demanded no concealments, he corrected himself by making another appointment, saying—"that he loved to do things openly, and would come to Mr. Pitt's house in Jermyn Street in broad day-light."¹ The meeting took place accordingly and with much courtesy. Lord Bute "frankly acknowledged that his ministry could not go on, and that the King was convinced of it, and therefore he (Lord B——) desired that Mr. Pitt would open himself frankly and at large, and tell him his ideas of things and persons with the utmost freedom." At first he was disinclined to convey views which might or might not be fully understood or appreciated by a man who had been placed above his own level, and was unconscious of the extent of his own ignorance. Still, as he had no opinions to disguise, or special interests to promote, he responded to the demand with unreserved freedom. The errors of the administration were pointed out, and remedies suggested in no very complimentary terms, and yet with marked civility. It was said that "Lord Bute heard with great attention and patience, entered into no defence, but at last said,—'If these are your opinions, why should you not tell them to the King himself, who will not be unwilling to hear you?' 'How can I, my lord, presume to go to the King, who am not of his council, nor in his service, and have no pretence to ask an audience. The presumption would be too great.' 'But suppose his Majesty should order you to attend him,' resumed Lord Bute, 'I presume, Sir, you would not refuse it.' 'The King's command would make it my duty,' replied Pitt, with a dignified energy, 'and I should certainly obey it.'" This interview was immediately reported to the King, on Thursday evening, and Mr. Pitt received an open note from him requiring his attendance at the Queen's palace in the Park, at noon day, on the following Saturday. Thus, unholy secrecy attempts to disguise itself in what it cares not to hide, by open parade. It pleased both parties, but from opposite motives. At the

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 1327.

appointed time, the great statesman repaired to the place of meeting through the mall in his gouty chair, the boot of which (as he said himself) "makes it as much known as if his name was written upon it." "He was most graciously received," says the Earl of Hardwicke, "and his Majesty began in like manner as his quondam favorite had done, by ordering him to tell him his opinion of things and persons at large, and with the utmost freedom; and I think did in substance make the like confession, that he thought his present ministers could not go on. The audience lasted three hours, and Mr. Pitt went through the whole, upon both heads, more fully than he had done to Lord Bute." * * * "He went through the infirmities of the peace, the things necessary and hitherto neglected to improve and preserve it; the present state of the nation, both foreign and domestic; the great Whig families and persons who had been driven from his Majesty's council and service, which it would be for his interest to restore. In doing this he repeated many names, upon which his Majesty told him there was a pen, ink and paper, and he wished he would write them down. Mr. Pitt humbly excused himself, saying, that would be too much for him to take upon him, and he might, upon his memory, omit some material persons, which might be subject to imputation. The King still said he liked to hear him, and bid him go on, but said now and then that his honor must be consulted; to which Mr. Pitt answered in a very courtly manner. His Majesty ordered him to come again on Monday, which he did in the same place, and in the same public manner."¹

The gracious manner of the King, his occasional questions and remarks, and apparent approval of suggestions which were made,—encouraged Mr. Pitt to hope that his advice would be taken.² He so expressed himself to the Duke of Newcastle and others, and was prepared to hear at the next interview of an entire change of measures. In this he was disappointed. He was received with marked condescension, and the conference lasted two hours. To continue the language of the same author, "The King began, that he had considered of what had been said, and talked still more strongly of his honor. His Majesty then mentioned Lord Northumberland for the treasury, still proceeding upon the supposition of a change. To this Mr. Pitt hesitated an objection, that certainly Northumberland might be considered, but that he should not have thought of him for the treasury. His Majesty then mentioned Lord Halifax for the treasury. Mr. Pitt said, 'Suppose your Majesty should think fit to give his lordship the paymaster's place.' The King replied, 'But, Mr. Pitt, I had designed that for poor George Grenville. He is your near relation, and you once loved him.' To this the only answer made was a

¹ Parl. Deb., Vol. xv, p. 1328.

² See Cor. Earl of Chatham, Vol. II, p. 88.

low bow. And now here comes the bait,—‘Why,’ says his Majesty, ‘should not Lord Temple have the treasury? You could go on then very well.’ ‘Sir,’ said Pitt, in a decided, but respectful manner, ‘the person whom you shall think fit to honor with the chief conduct of your affairs, cannot possibly go on without a treasury connected with him; but that alone will do nothing. It cannot be carried on without the great families who have supported the Revolution government, and other great persons of whose abilities and integrity the public have had experience, and who have weight and credit in the nation. I should only deceive your Majesty if I should leave you an opinion that I could go on, and your Majesty make a solid administration, on any other foot.’ ‘Well, Mr. Pitt, I see, (or I fear) this won’t do. My honor is concerned, and I must support it.’” Here was an interesting example of personal honor, allied with weakness and favoritism, placed in the balance against capacity and experience. In this may be seen the wide difference between Toryism and Democracy.

Another account of this interview is thus concluded by Cooke, and on unquestionable authority: “Mr. Pitt named a great number of his supporters, but refused to draw out, upon the moment, a scheme of a new cabinet. All who voted for the peace, with the exception of the Duke of Marlboro’ and Lord Halifax, he objected to, and declared that he would have nothing to do with the Duke of Bedford, or any Tory whatever. He had now discovered that a change had taken place in the King’s intentions since the last interview, and that it was doubly necessary to be firm in his demands, and guarded in his concessions. At last, when it became plain that the only terms upon which Pitt would accept office were, the dismissal of his opponents and the appointment of his friends, the King replied, ‘Well, Mr. Pitt, I see this won’t do; my honor is concerned and I must support it:’ and again, more passionately, he declared, ‘Were I to submit to such dictation, I had nothing more to do than to take the crown from my head, place it upon yours, and then submit my neck to the block.’”¹

Thus was ended a conference, which, to use the language of the Earl of Hardwicke, was “as strange as it was long, for I believe it is the most extraordinary transaction that ever happened in any court in Europe, even in times as extraordinary as the present.” He concludes the narrative in the ironical language of Terence,—“*Et sic finita est fabula. Vos valetē,*” but I cannot with a safe conscience add, ‘*plaudite.*’”² The Earl was evidently astonished at the recital of such disclosures. To him they appeared strange and even fabulous. And yet, such events are both natural and common in the political world, but they are not always truly reported.

¹ History of Party, Vol. III, p. 96.

sion of a Latin comedy by Terence. “Fare-

² “*Valete ac plaudite*”—was the conclusion, well, and applaud.”

The people are often made to believe, by designing men, either too much or too little. Too much when they rely upon fiction for influence, too little when they fear the influence of truth. By thus blending fiction with truth, they extend the domain of party, and multiply the chances of escape from detection in their dishonest schemes.

This period of England is particularly interesting and instructive. It should be carefully studied and remembered. The causes of the American Revolution here culminated and took form. The motives and interests of the people became identified with public affairs, and public affairs with the extremes of party. Royalty with all the buoyancy and thoughtlessness of youth, boldly asserted the strength of the government in the prerogatives of the crown, and was so confident in itself that it forgot the wisdom of capacity and experience. It looked for counsel in obedient weakness, and for aid in obedient party. The Tory party was again revived, and endowed with a new life, promising all that could be hoped for, and all that royalty could ask. Toryism thus restored,—the King was regarded as the vicegerent of God, the Church the spiritual protector of royalty, the Parliament the body-guard of the Tory party, and the Army and Navy the temporal forces of the nation—to do the bidding of the political hierarchy that assumed to dictate to the people in what manner they might be permitted to do their own business. The people were to be guided, advised and aided, but not trusted. They were counted as faithful subjects only so long as loyalty to party was made the standard of loyalty to the crown. The government was narrowed to a paternal basis, without the instincts of affection natural to paternity, and the Tory party became the sole agent of its administration. The Constitution and the Laws were interpreted by a party majority in Parliament, and the people were made to believe that their will was the supreme executive of the land. Thus nominally and treacherously popularized, the Tory party became the government of England, and the government itself an irresponsible tyranny.

It was a period of political darkness. The great Franklin saw it and called for candles.¹ The gifted spirits of democracy feared it,—and in-

¹ In a letter to Charles Thomson, dated London, July 11th, 1765, Franklin writes,—“Depend upon it, my good neighbor, I took every step in my power to prevent the passing of the Stamp Act. Nobody could be more concerned and interested than myself to oppose it sincerely and heartily. But the tide was too strong against us. The nation was provoked by American claims of independence, and all parties joined by resolving in this act to settle the point. We might as well have hindered the sun’s setting. That we could not do. But since it is down, my friend, and it may be long before it rises again, let us make as good a night of it as we can. We may still light candles.” In reply, Mr. Thomson says, “I much fear, instead of the candles you mention being lighted, you will hear of the works of darkness.”—

voked the mercy of God and the help of man to avert the coming dangers. And here, what more appropriate than to pause and recite the beautiful lines of the poet :

“ Oh blindness to the future ! kindly given,
That each may fill the circle mark'd by heaven :
Who sees with equal eye, as God of all,
A hero perish, or a sparrow fall,
Atoms or systems into ruin hurl'd,
And now a bubble burst, and now a world.”

When man is doomed to tread the dark and perilous passages of life, Providence shields him by closing the book of fate, and spares him from looking upon the painful scenes which are to be disclosed by his own acts of perversity. The people of England were blinded by their own public servants, and by their acknowledged teachers of duty. Pride and ambition were enthroned in the high places of religion and patriotism, and party and passion presided in the temples of justice. And yet, there was a ray of light that encircled the globe,—and like the holy star of Bethlehem, gave joy and courage to people of every clime. An illustrious few, the sons of no particular soil, and yet the jewels of their native land ; a gifted band of patriots, inspired by a Pitt, a Burke, and a Barre ; encouraged by a Camden and a Lafayette, guided and nerved by an Adams, an Otis, a Franklin, a Henry, a Jefferson, and a Washington,—were alive and awake to the imperative demands of humanity, and declared the truth in the boldest language, and in tones of terrible warning. But the light of their wisdom was only sufficient to give more frightful outlines to the darkness which enveloped the nation, and to add new frenzy to the existing violence of unthinking weakness, and to make it desperate. The few, indeed, may have had visions of revolution and civil war, but the many unconsciously contributed their influence to render such calamities inevitable.

Thus stood the two great parties of the world. They were of the same blood, and of the same nationality. The one confident and defiant,—boasting the questionable privileges of birth, of class and of power. The other, standing on the unchangeable foundations of justice, and demanding liberty as their birth-right from God, and lawful protection as their inheritance from the British Constitution. The King, not unlike the champion of the Valley of Elah, whose sole trust was in the giant's huge frame and muscle, sword and spear,—looked only to brute force and coercion to

Sparks's Franklin, Vol. I, p. 294. When of Parliament in regard to taxation, which the author speaks of the “ American was now the subject of dispute.—*Ibid*, claims of independence,” he alludes to the p. 296.
claim of the colonists to an independence

conquer freedom, and to enslave the brave and loyal subjects of his realm. His formidable hosts were boldly met by a band of heroes, who, like the youthful champion of Israel, having faith in God, had no fear of man.

Nothing that is truly good and great for humanity is impossible. Nothing seemed impossible to Pitt.¹ Inspired by his love of truth and sense of duty, and by the patriotic spirit of his devoted wife,² he saw and measured the rising difficulties and dangers of his country, and fearlessly pointed out their causes and remedies. He asserted the dignity of the nation. He spoke for suffering and outraged humanity. His labors were for the world. He stood almost alone, and appealed to the spirit of democracy everywhere. He was congratulated by distinguished men of his own country on his great power and influence in public affairs. They acknowledged his greatness, but they had not the courage to follow his counsel.³ He was better understood by a democratic people in the wilderness of America, and by the crowned heads of Europe.⁴ than in his own narrow island home.

¹ In reply to a note from her husband, dated May 5, 1766, expressing an earnest wish to have her come to him the moment she had attended to her business, Lady Chatham says,—“Every minute between this and Monday is more than filled up, and they tell me I must stay longer. I adopt your rule, ‘*that nothing is impossible*,’ and so remain fixed.”—*Cor. Earl of Chatham*, Vol. II, p. 415.

² In a letter dated Feb. 22, 1766, Lady Chatham thus congratulates her husband on the vote of Parliament, on the 21st, of 275 against 167, giving leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Stamp Act: “Joy to you, my dear love. The joy of thousands is yours, under Heaven, who has crowned your endeavors with such happy success.” * * “I cannot tell you with what pleasure my eyes opened upon the news. All my feelings tell me that I hate oppression, and that I love zealously the honor of my dear husband.”—*Cor. of Earl of Chatham*, Vol. II, p. 391.

³ In a letter dated Aug. 21, 1766, Gen. Burgoyne thus writes to the Earl of Chatham:—“I entreat you, my Lord, to accept my congratulations upon your peerage and upon your engaging in the administration, as those of a man who takes the truest interest in everything that concerns

your glory and satisfaction, and who looks up to your lights and counsels for the salvation of his country. I move not a step upon the continent without seeing the impression your lordship’s *name* makes. It is a touchstone that no German hypocrisy can resist; and the conversation of every court, upon the present arrangement in England, betrays their disposition toward us.”

In a letter written at the Hague, on the 29th of August, by Sir Joseph Yorke to Sir Andrew Mitchell, is the following passage: “I am really concerned to see so many of the principal leaders of the Whig party retiring from business, which obliges our late Commoner to build upon a very narrow and uncertain bottom; but this may, and I hope will, be remedied before the election of a new Parliament. Had he delayed taking the title till that event, I think everything might have gone on smoothly.”—*Cor. of Earl of Chatham*, Vol. III, pp. 41, 43.

⁴ Sir Andrew Mitchell, in a letter dated at Berlin, Dec. 6, 1766, to Lord Chatham, gives an account of an interview with the King of Prussia. In reply to his strong assurances of Lord Chatham’s great influence with the government, the King answered, “I have a very high opinion of

It is not the purpose of this work to notice the continued measures of the reign of George III., further than is necessary to elucidate their results, as developed in the treatment of the American Colonies. The reader, it is to be hoped, will feel inclined to pursue the subject as he may have opportunities. The records are ample, and available to all.

Before proceeding, however, to recite and discuss the events of the American Revolution, it is proper that some consideration should be given to the subjects of WAR, and REVOLUTIONS,—as they are recorded in the history of the world. As they are permitted to have a place in Providence, it is obviously important that a place should be assigned them in the studies of history. These chapters will make the commencement of the Second Volume.

Lord Chatham, and great confidence in him; but what assurances can you give me, that he has power, and will continue in office?" "I replied, I had not the least doubt of either, as your lordship was now the darling of the King and people. His Prussian Majesty said, 'That does not agree with my accounts from England.' I assured him of the truth of what I advanced, and that I believed the contrary reports had been raised by your lordship's enemies."—*Cor. of Earl of Chatham*, Vol. III, p. 142.

APPENDIX.

A.

“Having, in the seventh paper,” (of the Freeholder) says Addison, “considered many of those falsehoods, by which the cause of our malcontents (Tories) is supported, I shall here speak of that extravagant credulity which disposes each particular member of their party to believe them. This strange alacrity in believing absurdity and inconsistency, may be called the Political Faith of a Tory.”

He pursues this subject in the fourteenth number of the “FREEHOLDER,” from which extracts have already been made, and thus concludes :

“Having thus far considered the political faith of the party, as it regards matters of fact, let us in the next place take a view of it with respect to those doctrines which it embraces, and which are the fundamental points whereby they are distinguished from those whom they used to represent as enemies to the constitution in church and state. How far their great articles of political faith, with respect to our ecclesiastical and civil government, are consistent with themselves, and agreeable to reason and truth, may be seen in the following paradoxes, which are the essentials of

A TORY'S CREED.¹

“Under the name of Tories, I do not here comprehend multitudes of well-designing men, who were formerly included under that denomination, but are now in the interest of his Majesty and the present government.

¹Page 19.

These have already seen the evil tendency of such principles, which are the *credenda* of the party, as it is opposite to that of the Whigs.

“ARTICLE I. That the church of England will be always in danger, till it has a Popish King for its defender.

“ARTICLE II. That for the safety of the church, no subject should be tolerated in any religion different from the established; but that the head of our church may be of that religion which is most repugnant to it.

“ARTICLE III. That the Protestant interest in this nation, and in all Europe, could not but flourish under the protection of one, who thinks himself obliged, on pain of damnation, to do all that lies in his power for the extirpation of it.

“ARTICLE IV. That we may safely rely upon the promises of one, whose religion allows him to make them, and at the same time obliges him to break them.

“ARTICLE V. That a good man should have a greater abhorrence of Presbyterianism, which is perverseness, than of popery, which is but idolatry.

“ARTICLE VI. That a person who hopes to be King of England, by the assistance of France, would naturally adhere to the British interest, which is always opposite to that of the French.

“ARTICLE VII. That a man has no opportunities of learning how to govern the people of England in any foreign country, so well as in France.

“ARTICLE VIII. That ten millions of people should rather choose to fall into slavery, than not acknowledge their Prince to be invested with a hereditary and indefeasible right of oppression.

“ARTICLE IX. That we are obliged in conscience to become subjects of a duke of Savoy, or of a French King, rather than enjoy for our sovereign, a prince who is the first of the royal blood in the Protestant line.

“ARTICLE X. That non-resistance is the duty of every Christian whilst he is in a good place.

“ARTICLE XI. That we ought to profess the doctrine of passive obedience until such time as nature rebels against principle, that is, until we are put to the necessity of practising it.

“ARTICLE XII. That the papists have taken up arms to defend the church of England, with the utmost hazard of their lives and fortunes.

“ARTICLE XIII. That there is an unwarrantable faction in this island, consisting of king, lords, and commons.

“ARTICLE XIV. That the legislature, when there is a majority of Whigs in it, has not power to make laws.

“ARTICLE XV. That an act of Parliament, to empower the king to secure suspected persons in times of rebellion, is the means to establish the sovereign on the throne, and consequently a great infringement of the liberties of the subject.”—*Freeholder*, No. 14, p. 81

B.

HOW THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND ARE REPRESENTED.¹

The following are quotations from an ADDRESS, entitled "*The House of Commons: Does it represent the people of England?*" delivered to the Birmingham Club, by CHARLES C. CATTELL, author of "*The Abolition of the House of Lords,*" etc :

"The House of Commons is supposed to be a reflex of the opinions and interests of the whole people, in contradistinction to the House of Lords, which is admitted to be merely the representative of land, property, wealth, and aristocratic families. I willingly, candidly, concede the point so often urged, that the House of Lords is an exclusive body representing nobody but themselves, their families, and their interests. But the Commons' House is supposed to be related directly to the Democracy, to be a Republican institution under a hereditary President, called QUEEN VICTORIA."

"Of the over 30 millions of people for whom the House of Commons legislates, only a few thousands are rich men, or titled, or aristocratic, or capitalists, or professional men, these are the minority of the nation, hence on the principle of proportion, which is justice, only a minority of such persons should be found in the House of Representatives. The fact is the very reverse of this. While the thousands are well-to-do people, the millions are the toiling people with limited means, and many of them are truthfully described as 'the suffering poor.' According to all common sense and just notions of Representative Government, the millions should not only have power to elect members, but should be *represented by their own class, whose thoughts and feelings, wants and interests, are identical with their own.* According to this view about nine-tenths of the Representatives should belong to the 'common people,' who are neither titled, bankers, capitalists, landowners, nor lawyers. Now let us see who is in the House. In the House of Lords there are in the Ecclesiastical Interest and connected with the land, 238, holding patronage of 7,943 benefices. In the Fighting Interests, in the Army, Navy, Militia, Yeomanry, Volunteers, etc., 119; besides Ministers, ex-Ministers, Placemen, etc. Surely the Upper Ten Thousand ought to be satisfied with this power in the country without monopolising 'the People's House.' We shall see. In the House of Commons the number of members is estimated as 654. Some of them appear as representatives of more than one interest, hence they unite on various occasions to protect the interests of each other. The Fighting Interest, the enemy of civilization, and the interest which has absorbed the earnings of the mechanic and the labourer for generations past, which might have given them food, comfort, health, good homes, pure air, education, manhood—in this interest we find 220 supporters! Aristocratic Interest—in the People's House—by birth, marriage, or both, 178 supporters. Agricultural Interest—represented by most of the 282 County members and many of the Borough members. The Money Interest finds supporters in 21 Bankers and Bank Directors, in 65 Railway Chairmen and Directors, and 103 connected with Trade as Manufacturers, Merchants, Ship Builders and Owners, Ironmasters, Brewers, etc. Authors, Engineers, Professors, Doctors, Editors, etc., 26. Besides all these, the Legal Interest is represented—by Barristers and Solicitors—by 107 members.

"Here we have the People's House *without the name of a single Working Man* in it,

¹Page 75.

not even one who is there to represent his 'Interest.' On this evidence, I declare the House to be a misrepresentation of the people of England. It is a representation of money, powerful Corporations, titled families, and place hunters in the Army, the Navy, and the Church. It legislates for land, money, and family interests, instead of for the interests of the whole people—it votes millions of taxation, and refuses even to admit an enquiry into the manner in which it is spent."

"Not only this—it has allowed the land of the United Kingdom to be monopolised by a few thousand people. In 1786 the soil of England was owned by 250,000 corporations and proprietors, in 1822 by 82,000, and by its legislation it has driven millions from the country of their birth, while there are about 80 millions of acres of waste land in the kingdom, one-half of which might be cultivated, and render us less dependent on other countries for our daily food.

"On the 21st November, 1660, the House consisted entirely of *land-holders*, and they, by act of Parliament, made themselves *land-owners*. At the time, some members called this 'a shameful fraud and robbery.'

"With a House full of landowners and their supporters—how are we to get free trade in land or protection for the cultivator? They care more for sport than for the people; hence the odious and abominable Game Laws, under which 10,000 persons are fined or imprisoned every year. The expenses of these prosecutions are taken out of the pockets of ratepayers. It is estimated that game prevents the cultivation of 15 million acres of land which might produce food for the people. Mr. READ, member for Norfolk, states that in his country '18,000 acres of land are untenanted on account of game.' It is estimated that the Game Laws diminish the supply of home-grown food to the amount of millions per annum—probably exceeding in value the whole of our importation from other countries. The House is without excuse in this matter, for Mr. BRIGHT's committee so far back as 1845 supplied ample evidence to justify the immediate and total abolition of the Game Laws. We are told that two hares eat and destroy as much as one sheep, that a pair of deer displaces 50 sheep, four cattle, and one family. Thus the people are driven from the land and starved by a sporting House of Commons!"

"Mr. JOHN FREARSON says* this House 'from the year 1800 to 1848 passed more than 14,000 Acts, *the great majority of which were real obstructions to progress*.' He contends that lawcraft has become such a grievance that 'the 80,000 artificial laws must be abolished' and a system be adopted in harmony with Science and the wants and rights of man.

"The chief good that this House has done in this generation may be described as *negative*, for it consists in the abolition of the laws that kept the people without food, air, and light in their houses, without the rights of citizenship, and without education for the generation that is to become the men—the disgrace or the glory—of this great empire.

"This nation has been described by visitors as containing the most riches and the most poverty, the finest Universities and the most ignorant people. The House of Commons has had the power to alter the laws which tend to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and to insist on Secular Education for every child born to the nation. It has done none of these things."

"It is now evident to all thinking men that their only resource is to change the character of the House altogether, and place men in it whose opinions and interests are in harmony with the millions whose welfare is immediately concerned in every vote and measure submitted to the House. The time has arrived for a change—one of such magnitude and importance as has not been submitted to the nation before, but which will receive its immediate and earnest attention.

*Parliamentary Politics Criticised.

“In proof of my statements I call your attention to the fact that on the question of paying election expenses 256 of these ‘gentlemen’ voted in favor of the poor man paying them, against 160 on the contrary, thus effectually shutting the door of the House in his face. On this subject Sir CHARLES DILKE says :”—

“‘Now, the 160 represented 1,670,000 voters, and the 256, a few short of the same number; or Government, beaten by a hundred, had yet a majority of voters on its side. Not only are divisions often changed as to their results, and minorities represented as majorities, but some apparently infinitesimally small minorities, when examined from this point of view, become large. For instance, in 1870, 26 members only, including tellers, voted for payment of members; but these 26 represented 300,000 voters, or 12,000 voters apiece. So, again, the 46 members who voted against the match-tax represented 660,000 voters in the constituencies; and the 110 members who voted with Mr. Rylands against paying the illegal over-regulation price for commissions, in the army, represented 1,260,000 voters. I need not multiply instances of this kind. Almost every day of the session supplies them in greater or less degree; and I maintain that, when examined with care, the division lists give such startling results as to justify any-one in declaring that no kind of finality can be said to have been reached in parliamentary reform so long as the existing anomalies in the weight of votes continue. (Cheers.) It is almost impossible to realise the extent to which these anomalies go. Mrs. Fawcett once stated about as strong a case in a few words as can well be put, when she said that the ‘electors of Portarlington had 132 times as much representation as the electors of Glasgow;’ and the same would be true if, for Glasgow, we substituted Manchester or Marylebone. The metropolitan boroughs contain $3\frac{1}{4}$ millions of inhabitants; they have 300,000 voters, and 22 members, or one member to 14,000 voters, and 145,000 inhabitants. The four towns of Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Birmingham, have altogether half as many inhabitants, two-thirds as many voters, and one more than half as many members. Adding them to London, we get 34 members, representing five millions of people, and 500,000 voters. On the other hand, I can find you 31 small boroughs, with a population of 150,000 people, and with less than 16,000 voters, having the same number of members—(hear, hear), or I can find you 70 boroughs returning 85 members to the House of Commons, and having altogether a population about equal to that of Manchester, with about the same number of voters; they returning 85 members while Manchester returns three. (Shame.) And I can find you 85 members representing the 42 large boroughs, with 8,500,000⁹ of people, and 890,000 voters—that is to say, each member representing 100,000 people, and far more than 10,000 voters, to set off against a similar number of members representing one-twentieth of that population. . . . There are 60 boroughs having less than 1,000 voters each. They return 60 members by 40,000 voters, and a population of about 300,000. Hackney, with the same number of voters and a larger population, returns two members instead of 60! Besides these 60 boroughs—of which only two are Scotch—there are four Scotch counties under 1,000 voters each—namely, Haddingtonshire, Sutherlandshire (with only 358), Ross, and Peebles; or altogether, four members to 3,000 voters. These four Scotch counties might be thrown together with others. If to the 60 boroughs we add the four Scotch counties, we obtain 64 members returned by 43,000 voters; and if we compare with these constituencies London and the 11 next largest cities, and the greater divisions of the counties of Middlesex, Lancashire, and Yorkshire, we shall find that 43,000 voters in the small and mostly-corrupt constituencies have the same number of members, and therefore the same weight in legislation, as 850,000 voters in the great and pure constituencies. The comparison may be carried even farther, and into larger figures still. The 52 largest constituencies have together 110 members for 1,080,000 voters. But, on the other hand, I can find you 110 other members of the House of Commons who represent but 80,000 voters, instead of 1,080,000! (Hear, hear.) When we see these things, and remember the elaborate checks against democracy by which the Conservative Reform Bill at first was guarded, and how little after all there was in its provisions, we, I think, may be able to compare that Bill to one of those conjuror’s parcels from which children tear off cover after cover, and find at last that after all there was nothing but covers, and that there is absolutely no inside. (Laughter and cheers.)’

“From a summary of cities, boroughs, and districts, we obtain the following results :— Of 191, having a population over 3,000,000, 414,572 electors, paying £766,664. income-tax, have 246 members; 51, with over 9,000,000 population, 980,646 electors, paying

* Address at Manchester, November 4, 1871.

£4,828,877., have only 116 members. And this state of things exists after the new Reform Bill. Mr. D'ISRAELI is supposed to understand this question, yet his Bill leaves our system with these glaring anomalies. Look at Birmingham, with 42,880 electors, paying £114,349., has only 3 members, while Mr. D'ISRAELI's own county, with only 7,894 electors, paying only £39,875., has the same number of members. The great point I wish you to observe is that the House has made these unjust arrangements, that it has had the power to rectify them, and has not done so! Besides all these anomalies in the proportion of electors to representatives, there are 51 English towns, having a population in each varying between 10,000 and 70,000, the aggregate population being *over a million of people, without any representation at all*. In the counties, over 11,000,000 of people, paying over £2,000,000., have 125 members, while 7,000,000, paying less than £2,000,000., have 158 members returned by 120,000 less electors than the 125!

“In addition to what has been urged, the House of Commons has misappropriated the public money in voting or permitting to be extracted from the hard earnings of the people nearly £4,000,000 per annum for annuities, pensions, etc. If the House consisted of representatives of the people, who have to earn this money, such payments would not be voted by them. Any men elected by working-men, who gave their votes in favour of continuing such a scandalous misapplication of public money as this, would never be sent a second time to administer the affairs of the people of England. The total payments for annuities, allowances, pensions, etc., is £3,924,571. 7s. 2d. Among these payments we find many thousands a year voted to men who have been employed by Government, and the reason given for payments is that they have nothing to do now, that their office is abolished or reorganised, and, not only so, but the amount paid is, in many instances, the same as was paid for services rendered. Here we have £12,000. voted to the Duke of CAMBRIDGE, and £6,000. to the Duchess of CAMBRIDGE; £600. to the Bedchamber Woman of Princess CHARLOTTE; £1,145. 11s. to J. HOLDSHIP, 1847, Ex-Chaff Wax; £1,076. 15s. to Hon. J. H. KNOX, 1830, Ex-Weighmaster of Butter; £150. to R. MUSHET, for ‘loss of prospects;’ £1,500., Countess NELSON, 1806; £3,500., Earl NELSON, 1806; £2,000., Lord RAGLAN, for services of late, 1855; £1,000., Lord RODNEY and heirs forever, 1793; £1,000., Lady RODNEY; £6,000., Princess of SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN, etc.; £2,160., Heirs of Duke of SCHOMBERG; £442., J. G. SETON, Deputy Chaff Wax; £8,000., Princess of PRUSSIA; £3,000., Princess TECK; £2,000., ditto, on marriage; £7,852., Rev. T. THURLOW, Patentee of Bankrupts, abolished fees, 1852; £4,028., Ex-Hamperkeeper, abolished office, 1852; £733. 6s. 8d., ditto, Ex-Prothonotary, loss of fees; £40,000., Prince of WALES, 1863; £10,000., Wife of Prince of WALES, 1863; £15,000., Prince ALFRED, 1866; £4,580., R. MILLS, Court of Chancery, office abolished 1842; £1,000., R. D. MORIER, Consular Establishment, office abolished 1832; £4,000., Heirs of WILLIAM PENN for ever, 1790; £1,580,000., Army Pension List; £7,700., Earl ELLENBOROUGH, Law Court, 1837. These are only samples from the great sack. I do not urge that these are any better or worse people than others in the same list. I say nothing against the recipients, but protest against the People's House voting such sums of the people's money to such persons.

“Besides what has been described, scores of objectionable features could be named which necessarily result from the composition of the House. Not being producers of wealth, they vote millions a year, and tax the people without a murmur. Taxation increases whether we have peace or war, and we are compelled to pay over and over again, a huge National Debt that the people never contracted. No Government should be allowed to exist that allows the land to pay a sixty-fourth part of the taxes which once paid a fourth of the whole, when its value was inconsiderable compared with its

present value. No Government should be allowed to exist that cannot govern this empire for less than £70,000,000. a year.

"When the people begin to think, they will act, and such scandalous anomalies and injustice as herein described will be swept away. The people have been 'robbed and bamboozled for ages,' said RICHARD COBDEN.

"Let the intelligent people assert their power—no longer sleep—no longer trust—no longer confide—no longer leave their destiny to others—but with knowledge and courage demand justice for all, and devote their intellects and their hearts to the emancipation of their long-suffering and injured fellow-countrymen."

C.

THEORY OF POLITICAL TRIMMERS.¹

The chief of political TRIMMERS was the Marquis of Halifax. He was a political adventurer. The following is an interesting account of him by Macaulay :²

"Among the statesmen of that age, Halifax was, in genius, the first. His intellect was fertile, subtle, and capacious. His polished, luminous, and animated eloquence, set off by the silver tones of his voice, was the delight of the House of Lords. His conversation overflowed with thought, fancy, and wit. His political tracts well deserve to be studied for their literary merit, and fully entitle him to a place among English Classics. To the weight derived from talents so great and various, he united all the influence which belongs to rank and ample possessions. Yet he was less successful in politics than many who enjoyed smaller advantages. Indeed, those intellectual peculiarities which make his writings valuable, frequently impeded him in the contests of active life ; for he always saw passing events, not in the point of view in which they commonly appear to one who bears a part in them, but in the point of view in which, after the lapse of many years, they appear to the philosophic historian. With such a turn of mind, he could not long continue to act cordially with any body of men. All the prejudices, all the exaggerations of both the great parties in the state, moved his scorn. He despised the mean arts and unreasonable clamors of demagogues. He despised still more the Tory doctrines of divine right and passive obedience. He sneered impartially at the bigotry of the Churchmen and at the bigotry of the Puritan. He was equally unable to comprehend how any man should object to saints' days and surplices, and how any man should persecute any other man for objecting to them. In temper he was what, in our time, is called a conservative. In theory he was a Republican.

¹ Page 369.

² Hist. of England, Vol. I, p. 227.

Even when his dread of anarchy and his disdain for vulgar delusions led him to decide for a time with the defenders of arbitrary power, his intellect was always with Locke and Milton. Indeed, his jests upon hereditary monarchy were sometimes such as would have better become a member of the Calf's Head Club than a privy counsellor of the Stuarts. In religion he was so far from being a zealot that he was called by the uncharitable an atheist; but this imputation he vehemently repelled; and in truth, though he sometimes gave scandal by the way in which he exerted his rare powers both of argumentation and of ridicule on serious subjects, he seems to have been by no means unsusceptible of religious impressions.

“He was the chief of those politicians whom the two great parties contemptuously called Trimmers. Instead of quarrelling with this nickname, he assumed it as a title of honor, and vindicated, with great vivacity, the dignity of the appellation. Every thing good, he said, trims between extremes. The Temperate Zone trims between the climate in which men are roasted and the climate in which they are frozen. The English Church trims between the Anabaptist madness and the papist lethargy. The English Consitution trims between Turkish despotism and Polish anarchy. Virtue is nothing but a just temper between propensities, any one of which, if indulged to excess, becomes a vice; nay, the perfection of the Supremo Being Himself consists in the exact equilibrium of attributes, none of which could preponderate without disturbing the whole moral and physical order of the world. Thus Halifax was a trimmer on principle. He was also a trimmer by the constitution both of his head and of his heart. His understanding was keen, skeptical, inexhaustibly fertile in distinctions and objections; his taste refined; his sense of the ludicrous exquisite; his temper placid and forgiving, but fastidious, and by no means prone either to malevolence or to enthusiastic admiration. Such a man could not long be constant to any band of political allies. He must not, however, be confounded with the vulgar crowd of renegades; for though, like them, he passed from side to side, his transition was always in the direction opposite to theirs. He had nothing in common with those who fly from extreme to extreme, and who regard the party which they have deserted with an animosity far exceeding that of consistent enemies. His place was between the hostile divisions of the community, and he never wandered far beyond the frontier of either. The party to which he at any moment belonged was the party which, at that moment, he liked best, because it was the party of which, at that moment, he had the nearest view. He was, therefore, always severe upon his violent associates, and was always in friendly relations with his moderate opponents. Every faction, in the day of its insolent and vindictive triumph, incurred his censure, and every faction, when vanquished and persecuted, found in him a protector. To his lasting honor it must be mentioned that he attempted to save those

victims whose fate has left the deepest stain both on the Whig and on the Tory name." * * *

"He was seriously alarmed by the violence of the public discontent. He thought that liberty was for the present safe, and that order and legitimate authority were in danger. He, therefore, as was his fashion, joined himself to the weaker side." * * *

"He pretended, indeed, that he considered titles and great offices as baits which could allure none but fools, that he hated business, pomp and pageantry, and that his dearest wish was to escape from the bustle and glitter of Whitehall to the quiet woods which surrounded his ancient hall at Rufford; but his conduct was not a little at variance with his professions. In truth, he wished to command the respect at once of courtiers and of philosophers, to be admired for attaining high dignities, and to be at the same time admired for despising them."¹

D.

ENUNCIATION OF TORYISM.²

"This enunciation of Toryism," as Cooke truly says, "well deserves insertion at length, in a history of our national parties. It is called,

"The Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, July 21, 1683, against certain pernicious books and damnable doctrines destructive to the sacred persons of princes, their state and government, and of all human society."

"Although the barbarous assassination, lately enterprised against the person of his sacred majesty, and his royal brother, engage all our thoughts to reflect with the utmost detestation and abhorrence on that execrable villainy, hateful to God and man; and pay our due acknowledgments to the Divine Providence, which, by extraordinary methods, brought it to pass that the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, is not taken in the pit which was prepared for him, and that under his shadow we continue to live, and enjoy the blessings of his government; yet, notwithstanding, we find it to be a necessary duty at this time to search into, and lay open, those impious doctrines, which, having of late been studiously disseminated, gave rise and growth to these nefarious attempts; and pass upon them our solemn, public censure and decree of condemnation."

¹ Hist. of England, Vol. I, p. 227.

² Page 395.

“ ‘Therefore, to the honor of the holy and undivided Trinity, the preservation of Catholic truth in the Church, and that the King’s majesty may be secured both from the attempts of open bloody enemies and machinations of *treacherous heretics and schismatics*, we, the vice-chancellor, doctors, proctors, and masters, regent and non-regent, met in convocation, in the accustomed manner, time, and place, on Saturday, July 21, 1683, concerning certain propositions contained in divers books and writings, published in the English and also in the Latin tongue, repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, decrees in councils, writings of the fathers, the faith and profession of the primitive church; and also destructive of the kingly government, the safety of his majesty’s person, the public peace, the laws of nature and bonds of human society, by our unanimous assent and consent have decreed and determined in manner and form following :

“ ‘The First Proposition. All civil authority is derived originally from the people.

“ ‘The Second. There is a mutual contract, tacit or express, between a prince and his subjects; and that if he perform not his duty they are discharged from theirs.

“ ‘The Third. That if lawful governors become tyrants, or govern otherwise than by the laws of God and man they ought to do, they forfeit the right they had unto their government. (*Lex Rex. Buchanan, de Ture Regni. Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos. Bellarm. de Conciliis, de Pontifice. Milton. Goodwin. Baxt. H. C.*¹)

“ ‘The Fourth. The sovereignty of England is in the three estates, viz., king, lords and commons. The king has but a co-ordinate power, and may be overruled by the other two. (*Lex Rex. Hunton, of a limited and mixed monarchy. Baxter’s H. C. Polit. Catechis.*)

“ ‘The Fifth. Birthright and proximity of blood, give no title to rule or government; and it is lawful to preclude the next heir from his right and succession to the crown. (*Lex Rex. Hunt’s Postscript. Dolman’s History of Succession. Julian the Apostate.*² *Mene Tekel.*)

“ ‘The Sixth. It is lawful for subjects, without the consent and against the command of the supreme magistrate, to enter into leagues, covenants, and associations, for defence of themselves and their religion. (*Solemn League and Covenant. Late Association.*)

¹ Richard Baxter’s True History of Councils.

than resist by force not only the king, but all who are put in authority under him.

² Julian the Apostate was a tract, written by Mr. Samuel Johnson, chaplain to Lord Russel, defending resistance in extreme cases, against the propositions advanced by Dr. Hicks in some sermons, that the professors of Christianity ought to die rather

This work probably contains the sentiments of Lord William Russell upon that important subject. See an account of it in the Appendix to Lord John Russell’s Life of Lord William Russell.

“ ‘The Seventh. Self-preservation is the fundamental law of nature, and supersedes the obligation of all others, whensoever they stand in competition with it. (*Hobbs, de Civ. Leviathan.*)

“ ‘The Eighth. The doctrine of the gospel, concerning patient suffering of injuries, is not inconsistent with violent resisting of the higher powers in case of persecution for religion. (*Lex Rex. Julian the Apostate. Apolog. Relat.*)

“ ‘The Ninth. There lies no obligation upon Christians to passive obedience, when the prince commands anything against the laws of our country; and the primitive Christians chose rather to die than resist, because Christianity was not settled by the laws of the empire. (*Julian the Apostate.*)

“ ‘The Tenth. Possession and strength give a right to govern, and success in a cause or enterprise proclaims it to be lawful and just: to pursue it is to comply with the will of God, because it is to follow the conduct of His providence. (*Hobbs. Owen's Sermon before the Regicides, Jan. 31, 1648. Baxter. Jenkins' Petition, October, 1651.*)

“ ‘The Eleventh. In the state of nature there is no difference between good and evil, right and wrong; the state of nature is a state of war, in which every man hath a right to all things.

“ ‘The Twelfth. The foundation of civil authority is this natural right; which is not given, but left to the supreme magistrate, upon men's entering into societies, and not only a foreign invader, but a domestic rebel, puts himself again into a state of nature, to be proceeded against not as a subject but an enemy; and consequently acquires by his rebellion the same right over the life of his prince, as the prince for the most heinous crimes has over the life of his own subjects.

“ ‘The Thirteenth. Every man after his entering into a society retains a right of defending himself against force; and cannot transfer that right to the commonwealth, when he consents to that union whereby a commonwealth is made. And in case a great many men together have already resisted the commonwealth, for which every one of them expected death, they have liberty then to join together to assist and defend one another: their bearing of arms, subsequent to the first breach of their duty, though it be to maintain what they have done, is no new unjust act; and if it be only to defend their persons it is not unjust at all.

“ ‘The Fourteenth. An oath superadds no obligation to part, and a part obliges no further than it is credited: and consequently if a prince gives any indication that he does not believe the promises of fealty and allegiance made by any of his subjects, they are thereby freed from their subjection, and notwithstanding their parts and oaths, may lawfully rebel against and destroy their sovereign. (*Hobbs, de Civ. Leviathan.*)

“ ‘The Fifteenth. If a people that by oath and duty are obliged to a

sovereign, shall sinfully dispossess him, and, contrary to the covenants, choose and covenant with another, they may be obliged by their latter covenants, notwithstanding their former. (*Baxter's H. C.*)

“ ‘The Sixteenth. All oaths are unlawful, and contrary to the word of God. (*Quakers.*)

“ ‘The Seventeenth. An oath obligeth not in the sense of the imposers, but the takers. (*Sheriff's Case.*)

“ ‘The Eighteenth. Dominion is founded in grace.

“ ‘The Nineteenth. The powers of this world are usurpations upon the prerogative of Jesus Christ; and it is the duty of God's people to destroy them, in order to the setting Christ upon his throne. (*Fifth Monarchy-men.*)

“ ‘The Twentieth. The Presbyterian government is the sceptre of Christ's kingdom, to which kings as well as others are bound to submit; and the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, asserted by the Church of England, is injurious to Christ, the sole king and head of his church. (*Altare Damascenum Apolog. Relat. Hist. Indulg. Cartwright Travers.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-first. It is not lawful for superiors to impose anything in the worship of God that is not antecedently necessary.

“ ‘The Twenty-second. The duty of not offending a weak brother, is inconsistent with all humane authority of making laws concerning indifferent things. (*Protestant Reconciler.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-third. Wicked kings and tyrants ought to be put to death; and if the judges and inferior magistrates will not do their office, the power of the sword devolves to the people. If the major part of the people refuse to exercise this power, then the ministers may excommunicate such a king; after which, it is lawful for any of the subjects to kill him, as the people did Athaliah, and Jehu Jezabel. (*Buchanan, Knox, Goodman, Gilby; Jesuits.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-fourth. After the sealing of the scripture canon, the people of God, in all ages, are to expect new revelations for a rule of their actions; and it is lawful for a private man, having an inward motion from God, to kill a tyrant. (*Quakers, and other Enthusiasts. Goodman.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-fifth. The example of Phineas is to us instead of a command; for what God hath commanded or approved in one age, must needs oblige in all. (*Goodman, Know, Napthali.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-sixth. King Charles I. was lawfully put to death, and his murderers were the blessed instruments of God's glory in their generation. (*Milton, Goodwin, Owen.*)

“ ‘The Twenty-seventh. King Charles I. made war upon his parliament, and in such a case the king may not only be resisted, but he ceaseth to be king. (*Baxter.*)

“ ‘We decree, judge, and declare, all and every of these propositions to

be false, seditious, and impious, and most of them to be also heretical and blasphemous, infamous to Christian religion, and destructive of all government in church and state.

“ ‘ We further decree, that the books which contain the aforesaid propositions and impious doctrines, are fitted to deprave good manners, corrupt the minds of uneasy men, stir up seditions and tumults, overthrow states and kingdoms, and lead to rebellion, murder of princes, and atheism itself; and therefore we interdict all members of the university from the reading of the said books, under the penalties in the statutes expressed. We also order the before-recited books to be publicly burnt by the hand of our marshal, in the court of our schools.

“ ‘ Likewise we order, that in perpetual memory hereof, these our decrees shall be entered into the registry of our convocation, and that copies of them, being communicated to the several colleges and halls within this university, they be there publicly affixed in the libraries, refectories, or other fit places, where they may be seen and read of all.

“ ‘ Lastly, we command and strictly enjoin all and singular, the readers, tutors, catechists, and others to whom the care and trust of initiating of youth is committed, that they diligently instruct and ground their scholars in that most necessary doctrine, which, in a manner, is the badge and character of the Church of England, of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well; teaching that this submission and obedience is to be clear, absolute, and without any exception of any state or order of men. Also, that they, according to the apostle's precept, exhort that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for the king and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; and in especial manner, that they press and oblige them humbly to offer their most ardent and daily prayers at the throne of grace, for the preservation of our sovereign lord, King Charles, from the attempts of open violence, and secret machinations of perfidious traitors, that the defender of the faith, being safe under the defence of the Most High, may continue his reign on earth, till he exchange it for that of a late and happy immortality.’¹

“ This manifesto was printed,” says Cooke, “ presented to the king, and conspicuously posted upon the gates of all the colleges and halls of the university. It will be noticed, that in it the Tories artfully mingled the essential articles of British freedom, with extravagances found only in the

¹ History of Party, Vol. I, p. 345.

ravings of fifth monarchy-men, and the declamations of desperate republicans. In their eyes the whole appear to have been equally atheistical, and equally objects of wrath.

“The Whig principle being one of continual progression, they have never been compelled to renounce it, that of the Tories being stationary, was therefore more inconvenient; but although the current of events soon tore away their grasp, and bore them far from their original support, they struggled long against its influence, yielded every foot with reluctance, and ever took advantage of any favorable conjuncture to win back a portion of the space between them and their original starting-point.

“During the last four years of this reign the Tories had been supported with the whole power of the crown: the prerogative they vindicated had been uniformly exerted in their own service, and the King himself had been but the head of their party.”¹

E.

CORIOLANUS, HIS WIFE AND MOTHER.²

Coriolanus boldly demanded,—“What they accused him of, and upon what charge he was to be tried before the people?”³ Being told,—“That he would be tried for treason against the commonwealth, in designing to set himself up as a tyrant,”—“Let me go, then,” said he, “to the people, and make my defence; I refuse no form of trial, nor any kind of punishment if I be found guilty. Only allege no other crime against me, and do not impose upon the Senate.” The tribunes deliberately agreed to these conditions, only to break them, making new issues which could neither be proved nor disproved—as they were predetermined to secure his conviction. After the people were assembled, they were compelled to give their voices by tribes, and not by centuries: “thus contriving,” says Plutarch, “that the meanest and most seditious part of the populace, and those who had no regard to justice or honor, might out-vote such as had borne arms, or were of some fortune or character.” He was accordingly tried, and condemned by a majority of three tribes, and sentenced to perpetual banishment.

Disgusted by perfidy, and stung to madness by an ungrateful people, he forgot his own high standard of self-sacrifice, and studied only how he could be revenged. Revenge abhors moderation, it leaps to extremes. He

¹ Burnet's Memorial. History of Party, Vol. I, p. 355.

² Page 484.

³ This is abridged from Plutarch's Lives, Vol. I, pp. 359, 374.

surrendered himself to the enemies of his country, to the Volscians, offering faithfully to serve them, and to advance their weal. As they knew him, feared him, and honored him—they accepted him with joyous demonstrations. They invested him as their chief in command of all their forces. After repeated successes, he marched towards Rome, and encamped only five miles from it. The sight of him there, caused great terror and confusion. All was anarchy and alarm, and after much discussion, it was agreed to send ambassadors to Coriolanus to offer him liberty to return, and to entreat him to put an end to the war. Those that went on the part of the senate were all either his relations or friends. He received them with great pomp and severity, and bade them declare their business, which they did in a very modest and humble manner. He answered with much bitterness and high resentment. As general of the Volscians, he sternly proposed,—“That the Romans should restore all the cities and lands which they had taken in the former wars; and that they should grant by decree the freedom of the city to the Volscians, as they had done to the Latins; for that no lasting peace could be made between the two nations, but upon these just and equal conditions, and he gave them thirty days to consider them.” Having dismissed the ambassadors, he immediately retired from the Roman territories. The Romans were spiritless, and made no good use of their time. When the term expired, Coriolanus returned with all his forces. A second embassy was sent “to entreat him to lay aside his resentment, to draw off the Volscians from their territories, etc.,” adding “that the Romans would not give up anything through fear.” He not only refused to give any other answer, but exhorted them to return within three days with a ratification of his first conditions, warning them that “it would not be safe for them to come any more into his camp with empty words.” The Senate having heard the report, considered the commonwealth as ready to sink in the waves of a dreadful tempest, and therefore cast the last, the *sacred anchor*, as it is called. They ordered all the priests of the gods, the ministers and guardians of the mysteries, and all that, by the ancient usage of their country, practised divination by the flight of birds, to go to Coriolanus in their robes, with the ensigns which they bear in the duties of their office, and to exert their utmost endeavors to end the war and to make peace. They were respectfully received, but he bade them “either to accept the former proposals, or prepare for war.”

Amazed at their own weakness, and distracted by their troubles, the Romans resolved to defend themselves within their walls,—placing their chief hopes on the accidents of time and fortune. They had exhausted their influence, and yielded to despair. As yet, woman had not acted. It was now her turn. Not as a citizen, but as woman. The Roman women had faith in divinity, they did not go to the senate, they did not go to the people. Most of the illustrious of the matrons made their supplications at

the altar of Jupiter Capitolinus. Among these was Valeria, the sister of the great Publicola. This woman was of high birth, and was greatly esteemed. Moved by divine influence, as she believed, she called upon other matrons to accompany her to the house of Volumnia, the mother of Coriolanus. When they entered they found her sitting with her daughter-in-law, Vergilia, with the children of Coriolanus. Valeria thus addressed them: "We address ourselves to you, Volumnia and Vergilia, as women to women, without any decree of the senate, or order of the consuls. But our God, we believe, lending a merciful ear to our prayers, put it into our minds to appeal to you to go with us to Coriolanus." In eloquent language she stated the emergency of their country, and she was nobly answered by Volumnia. After deploring the general calamity threatening the country, she thus concludes: "But it is still a greater misfortune to us, if our country is become so weak, as to have need to repose her hopes upon us; for I know not whether he will have any regard for us, since he has had none for his country, which he used to prefer to his mother, to his wife, and children. Take us, however, and make what use of us you please. Lead us to him. If we can do nothing else, we can expire at his feet in supplicating for Rome." She then took the children and Vergilia with her, and with other matrons went to the Volscian camp. They were conveyed in chariots ordered by the consuls and approved by the senate. The sight of them produced, even in the enemy, compassion and a reverential silence. Coriolanus, who then happened to be seated upon the tribunal with his principal officers, seeing the women approach, was greatly agitated and surprised. Nevertheless, he endeavored to retain his wonted sternness and inexorable temper, though he perceived that his wife was at the head of them; but, unable to resist the emotions of affection, he could not suffer them to address him as he sat. He descended from the tribunal, and ran to meet them. First, he embraced his mother for a considerable time, and afterwards his wife and children, neither refraining from tears, nor other manifestations of affection. Perceiving that his mother wanted to speak, he called around him the Volscian counsellors, and she addressed him in language of great power and propriety. Coriolanus listened with subdued emotions, but in silence. She continued, but he still stood silent. Feeling exhausted, and that nothing more could be said, she thus closed the scene: "If words cannot prevail," she exclaimed, "this only resource is left." She threw herself at his feet, together with his wife and children; upon which Coriolanus, crying out,—“O! mother, what is it you have done?” raised her from the ground, and, tenderly pressing her hand, continued,—“You have gained a victory fortunate for your country, but ruinous to me. I go, vanquished by you alone.” To commemorate this remarkable event, the senate decreed the erection of a temple and shrine to the FORTUNE OF WOMEN. Valeria was the first priestess of this temple, which was much frequented by the Roman women.

This is a lesson full of instruction, showing in a beautiful manner, what "women as women" can do.

F.

THE EMPIRE STATE.

The attention of the author has recently been directed to a very able lecture by the Hon. Horatio Seymour, of New York.¹

His comprehensive survey of the early settlements of the American continent, of the sources of political strength and wisdom; his interesting description of the physical features of the Empire State, and of its permanent geographical advantages; his apt and significant allusions to the growing responsibilities of Town, County, and State organizations, and their united power in directing wise solutions of the difficult problems of government,—indicate so clear a philosophy, and are so suggestive of a practical outline of historical study, that portions of his eloquent address are inserted as eminently entitled to especial consideration. Its entire perusal is recommended to all readers.

EXTRACTS FROM GOV. SEYMOUR'S LECTURE.

"I am glad that History and Political Science are made leading studies in this University, for they best teach how to meet great questions in a great way. They deal with present and remote, with varied and with world-wide topics. They show how men at different periods and at distant points dealt with private and public affairs, how opinions lay in their minds, and how many ways there are of getting at the great ends of good government. They not only give us views of the forms of government, and of the rules laid down by written law, but they also give us an understanding of the unwritten laws of public opinion and of moral feelings which make the character of a people. They teach us modesty as to our own views, and a just respect for the opinions of others. They help us to rise above that provincialism which is constantly creeping over us, and makes us laud and magnify ourselves, our State, and our nation. Wisdom grows less from the knowledge we store up than from the frames of mind we form. We cannot from the top of all the knowledge we pile up get foresight. It is not given to learning more than to ignorance to see what lies in the pathways of life. The future is dark to all alike. The great difference in the wisdom of men grows out of the fact that he who is studious, earnest, and honest, has a mind like the well-tilled field; when facts come, they are accepted, take root, and bear abundantly. The bigoted and conceitedly ignorant (which

¹ It is entitled,—*"History and Topography of New York: A Lecture by Horatio Seymour, at Cornell University, June 30th, 1870. See p. 200.*

is the most malignant form of ignorance) let facts and truths perish on the hard surface of their minds. Mr. Goldwin Smith gave us a happy illustration of this truth, in the address which we listened to with so much pleasure, this afternoon. Mr. Gladstone had as much learning when he upheld the union of State and Church as when he came out the bold advocate of the Irish Church Bill. His learning did not teach him the need of this reform, but it gave him that largeness of mind that enabled him to see truth when presented to his views; and, as the distinguished lecturer well said, he showed his greatness most in what the world calls his inconsistencies. A little and an uncultivated man shrinks from putting away his errors under the fire of partisan organizations.

"One of the great ends of education is to give us the right frame of mind. The histories of men and nations, and the studies of the social systems and public policy of the peoples of the world, are needful parts of education everywhere; but in this country they have a special value. Beyond others, we are called upon to deal with social and political problems on a large scale. Never before in the history of the world did any country gain in a peaceful way such rapid addition to its numbers. Never before was there a country where men, with the aid of machinery, acted so powerfully upon the state of affairs around them. Our numbers now increase nearly one million and a half in each year; about four thousand each day, more than one hundred and fifty in each rolling hour. Of these about one-quarter come from foreign lands. If we measure our victories in this peaceful contest with other nations by the terms of war, we find that we shall take this year more than three hundred thousand prisoners; not mutilated men, dragged unwillingly here, but coming in the vigor of life, bearing the riches of health and industry, who join our side, and thus double the victory.

"When we think of the growing multitudes of our people, the grand armies on the way to join us, the extent of our country, the variety of its productions, the diversities of the language and lineage of our citizens, we must feel that the study of political science is needed for the health and safety of the national life. The careful study of the history of other people is a great duty. The thoughtful consideration of the policies of government cannot be neglected without a crime akin to treason.

"But this duty has been sadly neglected. Our people are familiar with the story of the Revolution; but there is not a general understanding of the events which went before it. The Revolution was not in all senses the most important and far reaching fact in the progress of our country. Had the first effort for independence failed, independence would still have been gained in the end. It was merely a question of time. We cannot hold in too high regard the actors in that event. Their virtues and heroism worked out the victory at one struggle, and saved repeated and prolonged warfare. But back of that, a graver problem had been solved. What was to be the character of the civilization of this continent? When the youth reaches man's estate, it is a great event in his life. But it is of less moment than the character he has formed before entering upon the duties of citizenship.

"When we search among the roots of our nation's growth, we find them intermingled with those of European nationalities. The wars of the Spanish succession had much to do with the destinies of this continent. Our future hung upon the turn of the question whether French or English civilization should govern here. Should our continent be Gallic or British, in its aspect, religion, laws, and customs. That question was fought out in Europe as well as here. When Marlborough won victories at Blenheim, Ramillies, and Malplaquet, or when Prince Eugene swept the French from Italy and crippled the power of Louis the Great, they did more than settle the balance of the nations of Europe. They fixed the fate of this continent. Had these battles gone for France, it would have held all of this continent save a narrow strip along the Atlantic coast. The end was for

a long time in doubt, as the scales vibrated through the course of nearly a century of wars.

"Our people have not been well trained in the history of colonial events, nor of the political principles which grew out of them. We content ourselves with vague and mistaken ideas, giving undue prominence to some events, and overlooking others of the greatest importance. The characters of the first colonists were full of interest. That historian who will draw and group them well, and will show in what ways each settlement told upon the character of our people, will do a great service to our country. It will be found that to this day we can trace certain influences back to the founders of the Atlantic States. They should be brought out in a way to show how they shaped the events of this day, or how they moulded our Constitution and laws. We want clear views of the leading traits of the first colonists. Sometimes we hear painfully absurd speeches from the pulpit and the rostrum upon these subjects.

"The Puritans suffer most in this way. There was something heroic in their self-poised characters. They had what will always command respect—earnestness. It was carried to excess, and made them harsh. But an earnest man is always in some way a useful man. The self-confidence of the Puritans was something more than faith. They acted not on the theory that they believed, but that they knew that they were right. With stern logic they held that, knowing they were right, they could not tolerate a wrong. In the strong words of their first law-giver, they denounced religious toleration as 'a covenant with hell.' They did not believe in political equality, for they established a theocracy, giving the right to vote only to church members. They held that no man had any rights that they were bound to respect unless he was a Christian, and the 'right kind of a Christian.' This would seem to be a hard soil in which to cultivate public or private virtues; but such are the merits of earnestness and zeal, that we get from them, in a large degree, the force of character, the energy and the will, which mark our progress as a people. Their claims to absolute certainty in the correctness of their opinions led them to place a high value upon knowledge, and from the outset they bestowed great care upon education. In the cause of learning and in the conduct of business their descendants are foremost in the land. While the character of the first settlers of New England has been thus distorted, the early history of other of the first colonists has been neglected.

"The influence which Virginia exerted in this country at an early day, was due in a great measure to the fact that the wealth of the planters in the colonial period enabled many of them to get education at European colleges, when we had only feeble schools in this country. This gave the State great power over the public mind, and made her the 'Mother of Statesmen.' I might take up the several colonies and show how each had peculiar aspects, but the occasion will not permit me to do so." * * *

After giving a sketch of the physical outlines of the State, he continues:

"Thus our State enjoys the apparently inconsistent advantages of having the deepest channels for commerce with the West, and at the same time of being at the head of the great valleys of the United States. This is not a fact of mere geographical interest. It gives us substantial advantages. It enables us to penetrate with our canals and railroads into all parts of the country, by following the easy and natural routes of rivers. We can go into twenty States and two-thirds of the territories of the Union, without leaving the courses of valleys. No other Atlantic State can make a communication between its eastern and western borders without overcoming one or more mountain ridges. Thus, then, are we situated. One angle of New York rests upon the Atlantic, another reaches north to the St. Lawrence, while the third stretches west to the great lakes and the valleys and streams connected with the Mississippi. We are placed at the heads of the

great valleys, while the Mohawk and the Hudson unite them all and give us command of the commerce of our country.

“When our continent was discovered, the plains of the Mohawk and Western New York were held by a confederacy of Indians, who had subdued the country from north of the great lakes to Georgia, and from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. While their conquests were due in some degree to their bravery in war, yet they owed much to the geographical peculiarities I have described, which gave them easy communications between themselves, and avenues which led into the countries of their enemies. Mountain ranges divided their foes into different communities, while they were able to pour their united forces through the valleys I have mentioned. They held in subjection numbers far greater than their own, because they could attack and subdue isolated tribes.

“The conquests made by the Six Nations had great influence in shaping the civilization of this continent. The French discovered the mouth and the course of the Mississippi River and of many of its confluent. They first planted colonists along their banks. By the usages of that age, they had a right to all the territories lying along these streams. This gave them a claim to the Ohio, and the country west of the Alleghanies. If this claim had been upheld, the British Colonies would have been confined to a narrow strip along the Atlantic. As an offset to any rights gained by France, as first discoverers, the British Government contended that the country as far west as the Mississippi River, was held by conquest by the Indians of New York. That when these became subject to the British Crown, they brought with them their territorial rights. Upon all the Colonial maps, these were carefully and conspicuously marked out. To add force and give dignity to this fact, the Chiefs of the Iroquois were frequently called Kings; and when the Mohawk warriors were carried to London by Col. Peter Schuyler, they were received with great ceremony by Queen Anne, although the Court was then in mourning for the Prince of Denmark. At this time it was felt that the Indians of New York held the balance of power on this continent, and the French and English left no artifices nor influences untried to gain their alliance. On the one hand, the British had the aid of the Hollanders, who had won the good will and confidence of these formidable savages. This was fortunate for their cause, for the Colonial Governors were, in many instances, weak and unworthy men. To Col. Peter Schuyler more than to any other man of that period, we are indebted for the success of our Indian diplomacy, and it may be fairly said of him that he did most of all to shape the history of our country. On the other hand, while the French had inferior numbers on this continent, their leaders were men of great ability and enterprise. They had powerful allies in the French Catholic Missionaries. These men, full of enthusiasm, highly educated, and in many instances of noble birth, showed a heroism and devotion hardly equalled in the annals of any country. They sought martyrdom in the cause of their Church and religion, and the story of their wanderings and sufferings on this continent is among the most fascinating pages of history. They carried the Cross into all the valleys and plains of New York, and for a long time they held an influence over the western tribes of the Iroquois, which endangered the English power on this continent.” * * *

“The physical peculiarities of our State have had much to do with the first settlement of New York; with the character of its people; with the foundations of its society; with the development of statutory and constitutional law, and its influence over the policy of our whole country. Our commercial advantages brought us a cosmopolitan population from the outset. Commerce, the great agent of civilization, gave us, from the first, the best principles of government and of social and religious liberty then known to the world. The principles of the Dutch made Holland the asylum of those who fled from religious or political persecution. Their liberal views were imparted to the colonies they founded.

By drawing to their settlements here all nationalities and creeds, they made that toleration a law of necessity which at first was a measure of wise and humane policy.

"The world has never witnessed a scene of greater moral beauty than the Bay of New York presented under the Dutch government, and at a later day, while its just views of liberty continued to influence the community it had founded. At a period when rights of conscience were not recognized in Europe, save in the limited territories of Holland, there were clustering around the beautiful harbor of New Amsterdam communities representing different nationalities and creeds, living in peaceful intercourse. The Hollanders and Swedes at Manhattan, the Waldenses upon Staten Island, the Walloons and English upon Long Island, and the Huguenots upon the banks of the Hudson, found here a refuge from religious persecution. What civilized Europe denied them, they sought on this spot, still shaded by primeval forests, and still made picturesque by the gliding canoe of the savage. The exiles from Piedmont, from France, from the banks of the Rhine, and from Britain, lived here in peaceful concord, as strongly in contrast with the bigotry and intolerance which prevailed elsewhere, as was their civilization and refinement to the wild scenes and savage tribes who surrounded them. At a later day the persecuted Germans from the Palatinate were settled on the Mohawk. A colony of Scotch Highlanders, banished for their attachment to the Catholic religion, and to the romantic fortunes of Charles Edward, found a home, not unlike their native hills and lakes, in the northern part of Montgomery County. The Protestant Irish established themselves in Otsego County, and there were settlements of French in Northern and Western New York. A small colony of Spaniards once existed near Onondaga Lake, but were destroyed by the Indians. The Welsh came to this country soon after the Revolution. Almost every European tongue has ever been spoken at the firesides of our State, and used on each returning Sabbath in offerings of prayer and praise to the God of all languages and all climes. Nine names, prominent in the early history of New York and of the Union, represent the same number of nationalities. Schuyler was of Holland; Herkimer, of German; Jay, of French; Livingston, of Scotch; Clinton, of Irish; Morris, of Welsh; and Hoffman, of Swedish descent. Hamilton was born in one of the English West India Islands, and Baron Steuben, who became a citizen of New York after the close of the Revolutionary war, and who was buried in Oneida County, was a Prussian.

"As this was originally a Dutch colony, the character of that people, and their influence upon our institutions, demand particular notice. These colonists came here in the heroic age of Holland. She had then asserted and maintained her national independence in an unequal contest of eighty years' duration against the colossal power of Spain, which, under Charles V. and his immediate successors, overshadowed and threatened the liberties of all Europe. This war with Spain excited the admiration of the world. It should also excite its gratitude. It was a contest for civil and religious liberty in behalf of mankind. After the close of this struggle, Holland battled single-handed against the combined powers of France and England. It was the age in which she produced Maurice, the greatest warrior of his times; De Ruyter and Tromp, the ablest naval commanders; Grotius, who is yet authority on international law; and Barneveldt and the De Witts, the purest and most skilful statesmen. Twice in a century her people let the sea cover their land rather than it should be occupied by tyrannical oppressors. Such was their love for knowledge, that when the republic wished to reward the citizens of Leyden for their heroic defence of their town, they chose an institution of learning rather than commercial advantages, to perpetuate the remembrance of their patriotism. We should be proud that we derive so many of our political principles from this people.

"Nor is the debt of gratitude a local one. Holland was the asylum for the persecuted Puritans. It taught them the advantages of a republican form of government. Our

obligations are broader than this: they are national. Constitutional liberty was introduced into Great Britain by the revolution which placed upon the British throne the Prince of Orange, who had recently commanded the armies of Holland against those of England. The accession of the Dutch monarch essentially modified the character of the British government, and invigorated sentiments of freedom in all of her colonies. The Hollanders not only tolerated, but invited different nationalities and creeds to their new settlement. More enlightened than their age, they had made great advances in civil and religious liberty. They rejoiced in the cosmopolitan character of their inhabitants. The rebuke given by the directors to one of the governors, who was inclined to persecute the Quakers, is a clear and beautiful illustration of their sentiments: 'Let every one remain free as long as he is modest, moderate, his political conduct irreproachable, and as long as he does not offend others or oppose the government. This maxim of moderation has always been the guide of our magistrates in this city (Amsterdam), and the consequence has been that people have flocked from every land to this asylum. Tread, then, in their steps, and we doubt not you will be blest.' It needs no argument to show where religious freedom was most respected. The Walloons, the Waldenses, the Huguenots, and many from the eastern colonies, flying from persecution, and clustering around the harbor of New York, mark the spot where liberty and toleration were presented in their most attractive aspects. It requires no discussion to prove whence we get our best ideas of constitutional and commercial law and municipal freedom. Not from England, depressed by the tyranny of the Plantagenets, the Tudors, and the Stuarts, for long centuries, down to the period of the settlement of this country; but from republican Holland, the 'Venice of the North,' the 'Queen of the Seas,' who, while struggling against the power of Spain, 'grasped the commerce of the world, and made it to supply the means to wage her unequal war with tyranny and wrong.' On the other hand, the vigor of character, the appreciation of education and religion, derived from the Puritans, are manifested in every quarter of our land; in public and private enterprises. Our people required and possess the characteristics derived from both of these sources. He who would seek to deprive the Hollanders or the Puritans of their just share of veneration, is unworthy to be the descendant of either." * * *

"It has been truthfully said that the wisdom of our institutions exceeds the wisdom of their founders. They established principles of more scope and influence than their authors foresaw. The germ of the township system existed in Holland, was introduced from thence, and perfected here by causes independent of the political sagacity of our fathers. The condition of our country is rapidly developing this policy. Equality of rank and the necessities of a thin population on the borders of a boundless wilderness, made all other arrangements unsuitable. It was most rapidly spread in New England, for the growth of her colonies was most rapid. For this reason it has been supposed by many historians to be of New England origin. More correct investigations into governmental history show that it was a feature in the government of Holland long before the settlement of America. The relationships which that country bore to New Netherlands and to the Pilgrims, entitle it to the honor of its introduction here. It is undoubtedly true that at first it was regarded merely as a convenient mode of conducting public affairs, and that it had no higher value in the minds of the early colonists. None foresaw its future importance.

"This system of local self-government keeps at home the mass of political power. It yields to the remoter legislative bodies, in diminishing proportion, as they recede from the direct influence and action of the people; it does not regard the central government as the source of authority, from which it percolates in limited measures to the lower jurisdictions: The vital principle of self-government is not the mere demagogical idea that the people, in their collective capacity, are endowed with a wisdom, patriotism, and

virtue superior to their individual characters. On the contrary, the people as a society are as virtuous or as vicious, as intelligent or as ignorant, as brave or as cowardly, as the persons who compose it, and will always be viewed accordingly by every straightforward man. The great theory of local self-government under which our country is expanding itself over our continent, without becoming weak by its extension, is founded upon these propositions; that government is most wise, which is in the hands of those best informed about the particular questions on which they legislate; most economical and honest, when in the hands of those most interested in preserving frugality and virtue; most strong, when it only exercises authority which is beneficial in its action to the governed. These are obvious truths, but how are they to be made available for practical purposes? It is in this that the wisdom of our institutions consists. In their progress, they are developing truths in government which have not only disappointed the hopes of our enemies and dissipated the fears of our friends, but give promise in the future of such greatness and civilization as the world has never seen.

“The legislation which most affects us is local in its character. The good order of society, the protection of our lives and our property, the promotion of religion and learning, the enforcement of statutes, or the upholding of the unwritten laws of just moral restraints, mainly depend upon the virtue and wisdom of the inhabitants of townships. When we shall have fifty thousand towns, this system of government will in no degree become overloaded nor complicated. There will be no more for each citizen to do than now. Our town officers in the aggregate are more important than Congressmen or Senators. Hence the importance to our government of religion, morality, and education, which enlighten and purify the governed and the governor at the same time, and which must ever constitute the best security both for the advancement and happiness of our country.

“The next organizations, in order and in importance, are boards of county officers, who control questions of a local character, but affecting more than the inhabitants of single towns. The people of the County of Oneida are more intelligent and more interested in what concerns their own affairs, than any amount of wisdom or of patriotism outside of it. The aggregate transactions of our supervisors are more important than those of our State Legislature. When we have secured good government in towns and counties, most of the objects of good government are gained. In the ascending scale of rank and in the descending scale of importance, is the Legislature, which is or should be limited to State affairs. Its greatest wisdom is shown by the smallest amount of legislation, and its strongest claim upon our gratitude grows out of what it does not do.

“Our general government is remarkable for being the reverse of every other system. Instead of being the source of authority, it only receives the remnant of power after all that concern town, county, and State jurisdictions have been distributed. Its jurisdiction, although confined within narrow limits, is of great dignity, for it concerns our national honor, and provides for the national defence. We make this head of our system strong by confining its action to those objects which are of general interest and value, and by preventing its interference with subjects upon which it cannot act with a due degree of intelligence. If our general government had the legislative power which is now divided between town, county, and State jurisdiction, its attempts at their exercise would shiver it into atoms. If it was composed of the wisest and purest men the world ever saw, it could not understand the varied interests of a land as wide as all Europe, and with as great a diversity of climate, soil, and social condition. The welfare of the several communities would be constantly sacrificed to the ignorance, the interests, or prejudices of those who had no direct interest in the laws they imposed upon others. Under our system of government, the right to interfere is less than the disposition many show to meddle with what they do not understand; and over every section of our great

country there are local jurisdictions familiar with their wants, and interested in doing what is for the right.

"It required seven centuries to reform palpable wrongs in enlightened Britain, simply because the powers of its government, concentrated in Parliament, were far removed from the sufferings and injuries those wrongs occasioned. Under our institutions, evils are at once removed when intelligence and virtue have shown them in their true light to the communities in which they exist. As intelligence, virtue, and religion are thus potential, let us rely upon them as the genial influences which will induce men to throw off the evils which encumber them, and not resort to impertinent meddling, howling denunciations, and bitter taunts, which prompt individuals and communities to draw the folds of wrong more closely about them.

"The theory of local self-government is not founded upon the idea that the people are necessarily virtuous and intelligent, but it attempts to distribute each particular power to those who have the greatest interest in its wise and faithful exercise. It gives to townships and counties and States the right to direct their local affairs, because they are the most intelligent about their own concerns. We know there are individuals wiser and better than the mass of these communities, but it acts upon the principle which governs us in private matters. When we are sick, we do not seek the wisest or the best man, but the wisest physician. If we wish to build, we do not look after the most learned man, but the most skilful mechanic. In the selection of agents, we choose those who are most interested in serving us faithfully. Acting upon these simple principles, the tendency of public opinion has constantly been in favor of taking power from central points and distributing it to those who have the strongest motives and the best intelligence for its judicious exercise. This system not only secures good government for each locality, but it also brings home to each individual a sense of its rights and responsibilities; it elevates his character as a man; he is taught self-reliance; he learns that the performance of his duty as a citizen is the best corrective for the evils of society, and is not led to place a vague, unfounded dependence upon legislative wisdom or inspirations. The principle of local and distributed jurisdiction not only makes good government, but it also makes good manhood. Under European governments but few feel that they can exert any influence upon public morals or affairs, but here every one knows that his character and conduct will at least affect the character and influence of the town in which he lives. The conviction gains ground that the General Government is strengthened and made most enduring by lifting it above invidious duties and making it the point about which rally the affections and pride of the American people, as the exponent to the world at large of our common power, dignity, and nationality."

"My purpose in this imperfect sketch of New York has been to point out its remarkable geographical position, to do justice to the first colonists, to vindicate the claims of its early statesmen to the gratitude of our whole country, and to call attention to the patriotism of its people. Heretofore, our citizens have been unjust to the history of their State. While our brethren, in other portions of the Union, have, with becoming and patriotic pride, recorded the services of their ancestors, and have erected monuments to commemorate the great events which have occurred within their territories, we have been indifferent to the glorious annals of the past. We are more familiar with the early history of New England or Virginia than with our own. Their citizens have, with pious care, recorded the patriotic services of their fathers, and have rendered them familiar to the entire population of our Union.

"While I have, on this occasion, briefly attempted to present to your consideration some of the prominent features in the history of our State, it must not be supposed that I desire to institute any invidious comparisons between New York and the other members of this glorious confederacy. I only wish to induce you to follow their example of

proper reverence for the memory of their fathers. While a monument towers upon Bunker Hill, exciting a just pride in the hearts of the citizens of Massachusetts, and respect in the minds of strangers for the State where Freedom's battle was begun, why is it that no stone marks the spot upon the plains of Saratoga, where Freedom's fight was won? Every schoolboy in our land is taught that the first blood was shed at Concord; how many of our citizens know that the first surrender of a British flag, or weapon, was made at Ticonderoga? The traveller who sails through Long Island Sound, sees on the shores of Connecticut the monument which tells of the massacre of brave patriots on the Heights of Groton. But what is there to remind him who passes through the Valley of the Mohawk of the thousands who were slaughtered by ruthless savages during the French war and the revolutionary contest? We have all been made familiar with the services which the statesmen of Virginia have rendered to the cause of civil liberty or constitutional law, while few are instructed that the earliest contests between the rights of the people and the pretended prerogatives of the crown were commenced and most strenuously maintained by the popular delegates in the Colonial Legislature of this State. The statesmen and the poets of New England strive to perpetuate the memories of the Pilgrim Fathers, to record their sufferings, and to hallow the very spot upon which they trod. Plymouth Rock has been made a sacred shrine where they annually pour forth their gratitude for the civil and political blessings which they enjoy. But how little is known of the more varied and more interesting emigration to the shores of our own State. While we honor the Pilgrim Fathers, let us not forget the Hollanders, who made earlier settlements upon our shores, and who made the harbor of New York a place of refuge from bigotry, intolerance and wrong.

"The past is full of noble examples animating us with patriotic love of our State and nation, but we must not confine our attention to the past. The present and the future have their obligations. Our geographical position imposes upon us peculiar duties in our relations to the rest of the Union. The progress of our nation will lessen the comparative importance of other States, however important they may be. It will be otherwise with us. Commanding the great avenues of commerce, of intercourse, and events, we grow with the growth of our country. It is our duty to emulate the patriotism of our fathers; to maintain the rights of the several States; to preserve their union, by confining the central government to the exercise of powers designed for the common dignity, defence, and welfare; and to restrain those sectional passions and prejudices, which are apt to grow up in States whose isolated positions do not give them the advantages we enjoy, of constant intercourse with the citizens of every part of our broad land. In all that concerns New York, let us not only be mindful of the past, but in everything that affects the education, morality, progress, and patriotism of our State, be animated by the spirit of the motto emblazoned upon its shield—EXCELSIOR."

G.

THE SOUTH SEA, AND OTHER SCHEMES.¹

The events of this period are not only remarkable and interesting, but instructive. Such periods are constantly repeated, and man can best study his own nature by turning to the records of the past. The following

¹ Page 535.

account of this speculative age, by Tindal, is taken from Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.¹

"On the 15th of June, 1720, the king embarked at Greenwich, on board the *Carolina* yacht, and landed the next morning at Helvoetsluys, from whence he proceeded to Hanover.

"Whilst the king was employed abroad in hearing and settling the grievances and interests of the nations and their sovereigns, particularly those of the protestants of Germany, the Regency were no less employed at home in curbing the excessive desire of gain, which the progress of the South Sea Company had raised, and in curing the despair which attended its fall. As these are the most considerable events of this reign, and such as will never be forgot by Great Britain, they deserve to be related at large.

"When the Bill passed in favour of the South Sea Company, it was expected, the stock would have greatly advanced, but the contrary happened; for the day after it fell from 310 to 290. In order to raise it, a rumour was spread, that earl Stanhope had received overtures in France to exchange Gibraltar and Port-Mahon for some places in Peru, for the security and enlargement of the English trade in the South Sea; which had its effect in Exchange-alley. For, on the 12th of April, five days after the royal assent was given to the bill, the directors opened their books for a subscription of a million, at the rate of 300*l.* for every 100*l.* capital. Such was the concourse of people of all ranks, that this first subscription was found to amount to above two millions of original stock. It was to be paid at five payments of 60*l.* each, for one share of 100*l.* In a few days the stock advanced to 340, and the subscriptions were sold for double the price of the first payment. To raise the stock still higher, on the 21st of April it was declared in a General Court, that the Midsummer dividend should be ten per cent. and all subscriptions should be entitled to the same. These Resolutions answering the end designed, the Directors, to improve the infatuation of the monied men, opened their books for a second subscription of one million, at 400*l.* per cent. In a few hours, no less than a million and a half was subscribed at that rate; and so great was the confidence which was placed in the Directors, that many deposited in their hands their annuities, without knowing what price the company would allow for them.

"On the 19th of May, the Directors thought fit to settle the terms and prices for the long and short annuities, which had been subscribed; and the stock being that day 375*l.* per cent. it was resolved to allow, for every 100*l.* per annum of the long annuities, 700*l.* in the capital stock (which at 375*l.* per cent. amounted to 2,625*l.*) and 575*l.* in bonds and money: So the total for each 100*l.* per annum amounted to 3,200*l.* or thirty-two years' purchase. For every 90*l.* per annum of the short annuities, they agreed to allow 350*l.* in the capital stock, which at 375*l.* per cent. amounted to 1312*l.* 10*s.* and in bonds and money, 217*l.* 10*s.* which together made 1530*l.* or seventeen years' purchase.

"These offers occasioned at first great murmurings among the Annuitants, who, having expected ten years, found they were to have but eight years and a quarter's purchase. Upon which some withdrew their orders, and others resolved not to subscribe. But the South Sea managers having found means to raise their stock to 500*l.* per cent. most of the annuitants appeared easy; so that it was computed, that, by the 29th of May, almost two-thirds of the annuities were subscribed.

"The arts of the stock-jobbers drew a great concourse of persons of all ranks into Exchange-alley, by whose unexampled eagerness of laying out their money in a fund, that promised so plentiful a return of gain, that stock, which about the latter end of May,

was at about 550, rose on a sudden so prodigiously, that on Thursday, the 2d of June, it came up to 890. Many cautious persons being willing to take this opportunity to secure their great profits, there appeared the next day so many sellers in the alley, that, by two or three o'clock in the afternoon, the stock fell to 640; at which the Chief Directors of the South Sea Company, being alarmed, set their agents to work, by whose artful management the stock was the same evening advanced to 750; about which price, with some small fluctuation, it continued till the closing of the Company's books on the 22d of June. In the mean time, the South Sea stock suffered a considerable shock. For many persons, who were to follow the king to Hanover, and others, who found a difficulty of making their second payment to the first subscription, were both equally desirous to turn their stock into money; so that, for some days, the number of sellers exceeded that of buyers. Wherefore the managers of the Company formed two expedients; the first was their lending out money, or notes, to the proprietors of their capital stock, to the sum of 400*l.* upon 100*l.* original stock (which showed it to be worth above that sum) at the rate of 4*l.* per cent. per annum. The second was their giving public notice, 'That all persons possessed of any of the Company's bonds, which fell due on the 25th of June, might then have their money for the same of the Company's cashier; and that the bonds would be taken in on the second payment for the 2,250,000*l.* South Sea stock, sold by subscription after the rate of 300*l.* for each 100*l.* original stock.' By these means money being plenty, and the stock-jobbers in good humour, the South Sea Company opened their books for a third subscription, at the rate of 1,000*l.* for each 100*l.* capital stock, to be paid in ten equal payments, one in hand, and the other nine half-yearly. But some men in power having taken this opportunity to oblige their friends, their lists were so full, that the Directors enlarged it to four millions capital stock, which at that price amounted to forty millions sterling. And, what is more strange, these last subscriptions were, before the end of June, sold at above 2,000*l.* per cent. advance, and, after the closing of the transfer-books, the original stock rose to above 1,000*l.* per cent. At the same time the first subscriptions were at 560, and the second at 610 per cent. advance, the Bank at 260, and East India at 440.

"The whole nation was become stock-jobbers. The South Sea was like an infectious distemper, which spread itself in an astonishing manner. Every evening produced new projects, which were justly called Bubbles, new Companies appeared every day. These were countenanced by the greatest of the nobility. The prince of Wales¹ was governor of the Welsh Copper; the duke of Chandos, of York Buildings; the duke of Bridgewater formed a company for building houses in London and Westminster. There were near a hundred different kinds of projects or bubbles; and it was computed, that above a million and a half was won and lost by these unwarrantable practices, by which many unwary persons were defrauded and impoverished, and a few crafty men enriched, to the great detriment of domestic trade. The king had, the same day the Parliament rose, published a Proclamation,² declaring all these unlawful projects should be deemed as

¹ "The Speaker and Mr. Walpole could not dissuade the Prince from being governor of this Copper Company, though they told him he would be prosecuted, mentioned in parliament, and cried in the Alley, upon the foot of Onslow's Insurance, Chetwynde's Bubble, prince of Wales' Bubble, &c., he has already got 40,000*l.* by it." Coxe's Walpole. Correspondence; Secretary Craggs to Earl Stanhope."

² "This Proclamation put a stop to the late pernicious projects and undertakings, which to the

number of about a hundred, were first set on foot and promoted by crafty knaves; then pursued by multitudes of covetous fools; and, at last, appeared to be in effect, what their vulgar appellation denoted them to be, viz. Bubbles, or mere cheats. It was computed, that near one million and a half sterling, was won or lost by these extravagant and unwarrantable practices, whereby many unwary persons were defrauded and impoverished, and a few busy upstarts enriched, to the great detriment of domestic trade." Political State."

common nuisances, and prosecuted as such; with the penalty of 500*l.* for any broker to buy or sell any shares in them. Notwithstanding this Proclamation, several of the illegal projects were still carried on; upon which the Lords Justices, on the 12th of July, to put a stop to all farther proceedings, ordered all the Petitions,¹ that had been presented for Patents and Charters, to be dismissed.

¹ "The following is a Copy of the said Order:

"At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 12th of July, 1720. Present, their Excellencies the Lords Justices in Council.

"Their excellencies the lords justices in council taking into consideration the many inconveniences arising to the public, from several projects set on foot for raising of joint stocks for various purposes; and that a great many of his majesty's subjects have been drawn in to part with their money, on pretence of assurances that their Petitions for patents and charters, to enable them to carry on the same, would be granted: to prevent such impositions, their excellencies, this day, ordered the said several Petitions, together with such reports from the Board of Trade, and from his majesty's Attorney and Solicitor-general, as had been obtained thereon, to be laid before them, and after mature consideration thereof, were pleased, by advice of his majesty's privy-council, to order, That the said Petitions be dismissed. Which are as followeth:-

"Petition of several persons, praying letters patent for carrying on a fishing trade, by the name of the Grand Fishery of Great Britain.

"Petition of the company of the Royal Fishery of England, praying letters patent for such farther powers as will effectually contribute to carry on the said fishery.

"Petition of George James, in behalf of himself, and divers persons of distinction, concerned in a national Fishery, praying letters patent of incorporation to enable them to carry on the same.

"Petition of several merchants, traders, and others, whose names are thereunto subscribed, praying to be incorporated for reviving and carrying on a Whale fishery to Greenland and elsewhere.

"Petition of Sir John Lambert, and others thereto subscribing, on behalf of themselves, and a great number of merchants, praying to be incorporated for carrying on a Greenland Trade, and particularly a Whale fishery in Davis' Straits.

"Another petition for a Greenland trade.

"Petition of several merchants, gentlemen, and citizens thereto subscribing, praying to be incorporated for buying or building of ships to let or freight.

"Petition of Samuel Antrim and others, praying letters patent for sowing hemp and flax.

"Petition of several merchants, masters of ships, sail-makers, and manufacturers of sail-cloth, praying a charter for an incorporation, to enable them to carry on and promote the said manufactory by a joint stock.

"Petition of Thomas Boyd, and several hundred merchants, owners and masters of ships, sail-makers, weavers, and other traders, praying a charter of incorporation, empowering them to borrow money for purchasing lands, in order to the manufacturing sail-cloth, and fine Holland.

"Petition on behalf of several persons intrusted, in a patent granted by the late King William and

Queen Mary, for the making of linen and sail-cloth, praying, that no charter may be granted to any persons whatsoever for making sail-cloth, but that the privilege now enjoyed by them may be confirmed, and likewise an additional power to carry on the cotton and cotton-silk manufactures.

"Petition of several citizens, merchants, and traders, in London, and other subscribers to a British stock, for a general insurance from fire in any part of England, praying to be incorporated for carrying on the said undertaking.

"Petition of several of his majesty's loyal subjects of the city of London, and other parts of Great Britain thereto subscribing, praying to be incorporated for carrying on a general insurance from losses by fire within the kingdom of England.

"Petition of Thomas Barges, and others, His Majesty's subjects thereto subscribing in behalf of themselves and others, subscribers to a fund of 1,200,000*l.* for carrying on a trade to His Majesty's German dominions, praying to be incorporated by the name of the Harbour company.

"Petition of Edward Jones, a dealer in timber, on behalf of himself and others, praying to be incorporated for the importation of timber from Germany.

"Petition of several merchants of London, and others, praying a charter of incorporation for carrying on a salt work.

"Petition of Captain Macphedria, of London, on behalf of himself and several merchants, clothiers, hatters, dyers, and other traders, praying a charter of incorporation, empowering them to raise a sufficient sum of money, to purchase lands for planting and rearing a wood called Madder, for the use of the dyers.

"Petition of Joseph Galendo, of London, snuff-maker, praying a patent for his invention to prepare and cure Virginia tobacco for snuff, in Virginia, and making it into the same within all His Majesty's dominions."

LIST OF BUBBLES.

"Besides the Projects and Undertakings above-mentioned many others had been set up and carried on, under the names of Bubbles, viz.

"For the importation of Swedish iron.

"For supplying London with sea-coal, a subscription of three millions.

"For building and rebuilding houses throughout all England, three millions.

"For making of muslin.

"For carrying on and improving the British alum-works.

"For effectually settling the island of Blanco and St. Tortugas.

"For an engine to supply fresh water for the inhabitants of the town of Deal.

"For buying and importing of Holland, Flanders-Lace, &c.

"For improvement of lands in Great-Britain, four millions subscription.

"The several sums, intended to be raised by these projects, amounted to no less than 300 millions sterling, a sum so immense, that it exceeds the value of all the lands in England, at the rate of 20 years' purchase. However, the eagerness of getting riches, by quick and easy methods, had at that time, so intoxicated the minds of most people of

"For encouraging the breed of horses in England, and improving of glebe and church-lands, and repairing and rebuilding parsonage and vicarage houses.

"For making of iron and steel in Great-Britain.

"For improving land in Flintshire, one million.

"For purchasing lands, &c. to build on, two millions.

"For trading in hair.

"For erecting salt pans in Holy-Island, two millions.

"For buying and selling estates, lending money on mortgages, &c.

"For carrying on an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is.

"For paving the streets of London, two millions.

"For furnishing funerals to any part of Great Britain.

"Another for buying and selling lands, and lending money at interest, five millions.

"For carrying on the Royal fishery of Great Britain, ten millions.

"For assuring of seamen's wages.

"For erecting loan-offices for the assistance and encouragement of the industrious, two millions.

"For purchasing and leasing improvable lands, four millions.

"For importing pitch and tar, and other naval stores, from North-Britain and America.

"For the clothing, felt, and pantile trade.

"For purchasing and improving a Manor and Royalty in Essex, &c.

"For insuring of horses, two millions.

"For exporting the woollen manufacture, and importing copper, brass, and iron, four millions.

"For a grand dispensary, three millions.

"For erecting mills for milling of lead, and purchasing of lead mines, &c. two millions.

"For improving the art of making soap.

"For a settlement on the island of Santa Cruz.

"For sinking pits, and melting lead-ore in Derbyshire.

"For making glass bottles, and glass.

"For a wheel for perpetual motion, one million.

"For improving of gardens.

"For insuring and increasing children's fortunes.

"For entering and loading goods at the Custom-house, and for negotiating business for merchants.

"For carrying on a woollen manufacture in the North of England.

"For importing walnut-tree from Virginia, two millions.

"For making Manchester stuffs of thread and cotton.

"For making Joppa and Castile soap.

"For the wrought iron and steel manufactures in this kingdom, four millions.

"For dealing in lace, Hollands, cambrics, lawns, &c. two millions.

"For trading in, and improving certain commodities of the product of this kingdom, &c. three millions.

"For supplying the London markets with cattle.

"For making looking-glasses, coach-glasses, &c. two millions.

"For the tin and lead mines in Cornwall and Derbyshire.

"For making rape oil.

"For importing beaver-fur, two millions.

"For making pasteboard, packing-paper, &c.

"For importing of oils and other materials used in the woollen manufactures.

"For improving and increase of the silk manufacture.

"For lending money on stocks, annuities, tallies, &c.

"For paying pensions to widows, &c. at small discount, two millions.

"For improving malt-liquors, four millions.

"For a grand American fishery.

"For purchasing and improving fenny lands in Lincolnshire, two millions.

"For improving the paper manufacture in Great Britain.

"The bottomry society.

"For drying malt by hot air.

"For carrying on a trade in the river Oronoko in America.

"For the more effectual making of balze in Colchester and other parts of Great Britain.

"For buying of naval stores, supplying the victualling, and paying wages of the workmen.

"For employing poor artificers, and furnishing merchants and others with watches.

"For improvement of tillage, and the breed of cattle.

"Another for the improvement of our breed of horses.

"Another for insuring of horses.

"For carrying on the corn trade of Great Britain.

"For insuring to all masters and mistresses the losses they shall sustain by servants, three millions.

"For erecting houses, or hospitals, for taking in and maintaining bastard children, two millions.

"For bleaching of coarse sugars, without the use of fire, or loss of substance.

"For turnpikes and wharfs.

"For insuring from thefts and robberies.

"For extracting silver from lead.

"For making China and Delft ware, one million.

"For importing of tobacco, and exporting it again to Sweden, &c. four millions.

"For making iron with pit coal.

"For furnishing the cities of London and Westminster, and the suburbs, with hay and straw.

"For a sail and packing-cloth manufactory in Ireland.

"For taking up ballast.

"For buying and fitting out ships to suppress pirates.

"For importing timber from Wales, two millions.

"For rock-salt.

"For the transmutation of quicksilver into a malleable fine metal.

all degrees, that the most extravagant Bubbles found many subscribers; some of whom sold their first subscriptions at a great profit, whereby the last buyers were considerable losers.

"The transfer-books of the South Sea Company were shut up the whole month of July. During that time, there was no great variation, except only that the price of the capital stock decreased gradually, from above 1000 to 930, in proportion as the third subscription at 1000 rose to 330 advance or clear profit. In the mean time, the directors, at a meeting on the 8th of July, resolved to open their books for taking in subscriptions of the lottery tickets, and other short annuities, to the amount of six millions sterling. But, though they did not then think fit to declare at what rate they designed

"About this time the following Ballad was publicly sold and cried about in Exchange Alley, 'which could not,' says the author of the Political State, 'but be grating to the ears of many of the nobility, gentry, officers of the army and other persons: who, by this time plainly saw, that by the mysterious management of crafty knaves, they had been led into a labyrinth, from whence they could not get out without the loss of a considerable part of their estates.'

"A SOUTH SEA BALLAD; or, Merry Remarks upon Exchange Alley Bubbles. To a new Tune, called, 'The Grand Elixir; or, the Philosopher's Stone Discovered.'

1.

"In London stands a famous pile,
And near that pile an Alley.
Where merry crowds for riches toll,
And wisdom stoops to folly.
Here sad and joyful, high and low,
Court Fortune for her graces;
And as she smiles, or frowns, they show
Their gestures and grimaces.

2.

"Here stars and garters do appear,
Among our lords the rabble;
To buy and sell, to see and hear
The Jews and Gentiles squabble.
Here crafty courtiers are too wise
For those who trust to fortune;
They see the cheat with clearer eyes,
Who peep behind the curtain.

3.

"Our greatest ladies hither come,
And ply in chariots dally;
Oft pawn their jewels for a sum,
To venture in the Alley.
Young harlots, too, from Drury Lane,
Approach the 'Change in coaches,
To fool away the gold they gain
By their obscene debauches.

4.

"Long-Heads may thrive by sober rules,
Because they think, and drink not;
But Headlongs are our thriving fools,
Who only drink, and think not.
The lucky rogues, like Spaniel dogs,
Leap into South Sea water,
And there they fish for golden frogs,
Not caring what comes a'ter.

5.

"Tis said, that Alchymists of old
Could turn a brazen kettle,
Or leaden cistern into gold,
That noble, tempting metal;
But if it here may be allowed
To bring in great and small things,
Our cunning South Sea, like a god,
Turns nothing into all things.

6.

"What need have we of Indian wealth,
Or commerce with our neighbours?
Our constitution is in health,
And riches crown our labours.
Our South Sea ships have golden shrouds,
They bring us wealth, 'tis granted;
But lodge their treasure in the clouds,
To hide it till it's wanted.

7.

"O Britain, bless thy present state,
Thou only happy nation;
So oddly rich, so madly great,
Since Bubbles came in fashion!
Successful rakes exert their pride,
And count their airy millions;
Whilst homely drabs in coaches ride,
Brought up to town on pillions.

8.

"Few men who follow reason's rules,
Grow fat with South Sea diet;
Young rattles and unthinking fools
Are those that flourish by it.
Old musty jades, and pushing blades,
Who've least consideration,
Grow rich apace; whilst wiser heads
Are struck with admiration.

9.

"A race of men, who t'other day
Lay crush'd beneath disasters,
Are now by Stock brought into play,
And made our lords and masters,
But should our South Sea Babel fall,
What numbers would be frowning?
The losers then must ease their gall,
By hanging or by drowning.

10.

"Five hundred millions, notes and bonds,
Our Stocks are worth in value;
But neither lie in goods or lands,
Or money let me tell ye.
Yet though our foreign trade is lost,
Of mighty wealth we vapour;
When all the riches that we boast
Consist in scraps of paper."

to take those effects, yet the proprietors entirely trusted to their integrity, and readily subscribed the same on the 14th and 15th of that month. After which the books were shut up. From that time to the end of July, the stock fell gradually from about 1000 to 900, including the Midsummer dividend. In the mean time, it being confidently reported, that the capital stock was to be enlarged by a fourth subscription in money, some persons in eminent stations desired the principal managers to put off the subscription, till the proprietors of the remaining part of the long annuities had subscribed, since the taking in of those public debts, in order to make them redeemable, was the main view, upon which the ministry and the parliament thought fit to encourage the South Sea project. Some pretend, that the men in power made this step, not only to free themselves from the importunity of many, who sued to be set down in their lists, for a share in the next subscription; but also, in order to reserve part of the to be increased capital stock, till a new set of directors were chosen, who should have a share in the profits of future subscriptions, in case the humour of buying up the same at an advanced price should last so long. However that be, in a committee of the Directors the 27th of July, it being considered that several persons, admitted as subscribers to the third subscription in money, had not yet made their first payment, it was resolved, That none but the Proprietors of their capital and increased stock should be admitted into the next subscription in money, at the rate of 20 per cent. so that a proprietor of 1,000*l.* capital stock should be entitled to subscribe 200*l.* In this Resolution, they, who hitherto had carried on this great project, with equal skill and success, had undoubtedly two things in view; first, to allay the murmurings of many of the old proprietors, who complained, that the directors and great men at court had ingrossed for themselves and their dependants most of the profits of the first three subscriptions. And, secondly, That, in case the eagerness of buyers should abate, which was to be apprehended from the daily sinking of the price of South-Sea stock, the company might be assured, that the new subscribers would make the several payments, to which they should submit themselves, and for which their capital stock would be a sufficient security. On the other hand, many of the old proprietors were so far from looking upon this Resolution as a favour, that on the contrary, they did not stick to say, 'That the directors, having had cream for themselves, would now give 'the proprietors the sour milk.' This complaint seemed to be the better grounded, because it was well known that those, who had got most by the South-Sea, daily endeavoured to sell out, and secure their vast profits; and, in particular, that the principal projector of this scheme had bought considerable estates in Norfolk and other counties.¹

"Pursuant to what had been desired, it was resolved on the 3d of August, at a Court of Directors, to receive subscriptions of all the remaining Long and Short annuities, Lottery Tickets, and other Public Securities, both redeemable and irredeemable. For which purpose the books were opened the next day at the South-Sea house, and continued so till the 11th of August. The day after, the Directors published the terms they intended to allow to the proprietors. For every 100*l.* a year of the Long Annuities, they offered 400*l.* in the capital stock which at 800*l.* per cent. (the price then of stock, exclu-

¹ How great the general infatuation or thirst of gain was, appears from the following instance: A proposal was offered 'for carrying on an undertaking 'of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is.' The projector formed a scheme for half a million, by which every subscriber, paying down two guineas for subscribing, was to have 100*l.* a year for every 100*l.* so subscribed. But how this was to be done did

not appear in the proposals, where it was also said, that in a month the particulars of the project should be laid open, and the money subscribed was then to be paid in. As extravagant as this scheme was, the projector in a forenoon received 1000 subscriptions, with which, amounting to 2,000 guineas, he went off in the afternoon."

five of the Midsummer dividend) amounted to 8,200*l.*, and in bonds or money 400*l.* making in all 8,600*l.* or 36 years' purchase. For every 90*l.* a year of the Short Annuities they allowed 200*l.* stock, which at 800*l.* per cent. amounted to 1,600*l.* or 17 years' purchase, and 7-ninths. The redeemable Annuities and debts (as well those at 4 per cent. as those at 5 per cent.) were to be taken in at 105 per cent. and allowed for the same in capital stock at the rate of 800*l.* per cent. exclusive of the Midsummer dividend.

"Many of the Annuitants were not satisfied with these offers, which, they said, put so great a disparity (no less than near half by half) between them and the former subscribers; for, by the resolution of the Directors of the 19th of May, there was allowed, for every 100*l.* a year of the Long Annuities, 700*l.* in the capital stock, besides 10*l.* per cent. for the Midsummer dividend, and, in bonds or money, 575*l.* all which (computing the stock at 800*l.* per cent. as it was given to the present subscribers of the like annuities) amounted to 6,785*l.* whereas, by these last Resolutions, there was allowed, for the same annuities, only 8,600*l.* For this reason some of the last subscribers went to the South-Sea house, in order to withdraw their effects; but they were told by the clerks, that there was no order from the directors for delivering them back; so the affair rested, for some time, undetermined.

"The uneasiness of the Annuitants put a fresh damp upon the South-Sea stock; but what affected it more was the boldness of many persons concerned in the illegal projects, who, in open defiance to the late acts of parliaments, to the king's proclamation, and to the orders and prohibitions of the Lords Justices, carried them on. Some of these companies, authorized either by charters or acts of parliament, did considerable prejudice to the South-Sea, by endeavouring to procure subscriptions. Upon this, the principal Directors of the South-Sea applied to those at the helm, and obtained an Order against them from the Lords Justices, which was published in the London Gazette of August the 20th, and which greatly affected the stocks of the York-Buildings Company, the Lustring Company, the English Copper, and the Welsh Copper and Lead, and of other illegal projects. This very much alarmed the persons concerned in these companies, some of whom sustained considerable losses, and all of them saw their extravagant hopes and expectations entirely vanish. Upon the murmurings occasioned by their disappointment, the Lords Justices ordered the Directors of these Companies to attend them at a general council, the 23d of August, where they condescended to tell them the reasons, that had obliged them to order a prosecution against them. The Directors, both of the Royal Exchange, and of the London Assurance, attended likewise, and were cautioned to keep strictly to the limitation of their charters, that no complaint might lie against them.

"The Companies ordered to be prosecuted, having recovered their fright, and consulted able lawyers, seemed resolved to stand trial, and assert their rights of managing their own affairs as they pleased. The Welsh Copper miners were yet more bold and refractory, for that very day (August 23) they opened their books, and made transfer of their stock.

"Before the Lords Justices had caused their order to be published, they sent a compliment to the prince of Wales, to acquaint him, that, the Company of English Copper, of which he had been pleased to be chosen governor, being illegal, they were obliged to involve it in the order; upon which the Prince sent a messenger to the Company, desiring them to choose another governor.

"All this while the South-Sea Stock continued sinking; so that on the 17th of August, it fell to 830, including the Midsummer dividend; which having given the directors no small uneasiness, some of their agents were immediately detached into Exchange-Alley, to buy a considerable quantity of stock, which thereupon rose to 880*l.* But, the humour of selling out continuing the two following days, the stocks fell again to 820, at which price the transfer books were opened on the 22d of August. That day, and the next

morning, there was a great crowd at the South-Sea house; and the directors observing, that great quantities of stock had been bought at a thousand, and even at higher rates, for the opening of the books, and that many persons would be obliged to sell out, in order to pay the difference, which could not fail of sinking the stock yet lower, they came to a sudden and unexpected resolution to shut the transfer books; and the next day to open other books, for taking in a money subscription of one million, to the capital stock, at the rate of 1,000*l.* for every 100*l.* capital stock, to be paid in five payments, 20*l.* per cent. in hand, and the rest in four equal payments. Accordingly the subscription books were opened the 24th of August; and there was such a crowd of subscribers, and amongst them not a few of the prime nobility, that, in less than three hours, more than the intended sum was subscribed; and that very afternoon this fourth subscription was sold in Exchange-Alley at 80 or 40 per cent. advance. The next day the principal directors, having consulted together about their future management, came to several Resolutions, of which, that very evening, they informed the public by the following Advertisement:—

South-Sea House, Aug. 25, 1720.

“The court of directors of the South-Sea Company give notice, that the transfer books of the company will be shut from the 31st day of August to the 21st of September, in order to the admitting as well the proprietors of the original capital stock, and of the stock for the last Midsummer dividend, as the proprietors of the stock for all the Long Annuities, 9 per cents., and Tickets of Lottery 1710, and of the several redeemable debts, which have been subscribed or deposited, or authorized to be subscribed into the capital stock, and also the proprietors of the first, second, third, and fourth money subscriptions of the company into a subscription of 20 per cent. of the capital stock, upon the terms agreed upon by the court of directors. The company will lend the first payment for the intended subscription to all the proprietors of the original and dividend stock, and of the subscription in the Long Annuities, 9 per cents, and Tickets of Lottery 1710, and in the redeemable debts; and of the first and second money subscriptions, without transferring their stock, or depositing the subscription receipts; which subscription books will be opened on the 12th of September; and such of the proprietors, as do not subscribe within that time, will be excluded the benefit of the subscription.”

“The next day (August the 26th) the transfer-books were opened again; but, the South-sea stock, instead of advancing, being by this time fallen under 800, the directors, who had now large sums of money in their hands, thought fit to lend to their proprietors 4,000*l.* upon every 1,000*l.* stock for six months, at the rate of 4 per cent. which enabled some of those, who had bought stock at a higher price than the present, to satisfy their creditors. What still embarrassed the directors was the case of the Annuitants and others, who had lately subscribed their public securities, and who thought it a great hardship to have the stock given them at 800*l.* per cent. when it was now little above 700, exclusive of the Midsummer dividend. In order to silence these and the like murmurings, a long consultation, on the 30th of August, after the directors came to a resolution, ‘That 30 per cent. in money should be the half year’s dividend due at Christmas next; and from thence for twelve years, not less than 50 per cent. in money should be the yearly dividend on their stock.’ What effect this resolution had, was soon after manifest; for, though it raised the stock to about 800 for the opening of the books, yet it soon sunk again, and in about three weeks fell gradually below 400.

“The Directors, having resolved the future dividends, thought it time to procure the sanction of the whole corporation; for which purpose they appointed (Sept. 8,) a General Court to be held at Merchant-Taylors-Hall, declaring, That this assembly would be

one of the half-yearly general courts appointed by the charter, and to choose a committee of seven, to inspect the by-laws.

“On the appointed day, the friends of the Directors took care to repair betimes to Merchant-Taylors-Hall, which, by nine o'clock in the morning, was filled; and many proprietors and annuitants, who endeavoured to get in, could not gain admittance. The directors having taken their seats between eleven and twelve o'clock, Sir John Fellows, sub-governor, acquainted the assembly with the occasion of their meeting; read to them the several Resolutions of the Court of Directors; and gave them an account of their proceedings; of the taking in both the redeemable and irredeemable funds, and of the subscriptions in money. This done, Mr. Craggs, Senior, made a short speech, wherein he commended the conduct of the Directors; and urged, that nothing could more effectually contribute to the bringing this scheme to perfection than union among themselves; and concluded with a motion, for thanking the court of Directors for their prudent and skilful management, and for desiring them to proceed in such methods, as they should think most proper for the interest and advantage of the corporation.

“Mr. Craggs was seconded by Mr. Hungerford, who said, ‘That he had seen the rise and fall, the decay and resurrection of many communities of this nature, but that, in his opinion, none ever performed such wonderful things in so short a time, as the South Sea managers had brought about: that they had done more than the crown, the pulpit, and the magistrate could do: for they had reconciled all parties in one common interest, and thereby laid asleep, if not wholly extinguished, our domestic jars and animosities: that by the rise of their stocks the monied-men had vastly increased their fortunes: the country gentlemen had seen the value of their lands doubled and trebled in their hands; and they had, at the same time, done good to the church, not a few of the reverend clergy having got great sums by this project: that, in short, they had enriched the whole nation; and he hoped they had not forgot themselves.’ One or two members of the assembly having offered to speak in favour of the annuitants, to censure the conduct of the directors, they were presently hissed to silence; and Mr. Hungerford, resuming his speech, continued justifying and applauding the directors, and concluded with supporting Mr. Craggs’ motion. The duke of Portland spoke on the same side, and said, ‘that he did not know what reasons anybody had to be dissatisfied;’ and gave in a draught of the motion for returning thanks to the directors; which being read by the clerk, it was unanimously approved. It was likewise agreed, that, according to the Resolution of the Directors, ‘the next Christmas dividend on the stock and subscriptions in money should be 80 per cent. and that a dividend of not less than 50 per cent. per annum be made from Christmas next, in half yearly payments, for not less than twelve years, upon the whole stock and subscriptions.’ They likewise agreed with the Court of Directors, to omit the 20 per cent subscription in money, which had been intended for the proprietors of the original stock and former subscriptions. After which a motion was made, ‘That the last subscribers, both of the redeemable and irredeemable funds, should have the alternative, either to withdraw their orders, or accept the terms offered them by the Court of Directors.’ But, the question being put, it was carried in the negative, three or four voices excepted. Then, upon the call of Orkney’s motion, the general court was adjourned.

“But, though the Directors carried their main point in the general court, yet the negative put upon the motion, in the behalf of the last subscribers, highly increased the public discontent, and raised such a distrust of the honesty of the managers, that the same day (Sept. 8,) the stocks fell to 640, and, on the morrow, to 550. Upon this, the directors resolved to open the transfer-books the Monday following, which having thrown some damp upon the Stock-jobbing in the Alley, the South-Sea rose that day (Sept. 9,)

to 640. On the other hand, several of the last subscribers of annuities went with a public notary to the South-Sea House, to demand their orders; and upon the refusal of the officers to deliver them, the proprietors made their protests in due form, and resolved to seek their remedy at law. In the mean time, they loudly complained of the unfair manner, in which they were drawn in to subscribe their annuities, for, it seems, at the top of every page of the subscription-book, there was a short letter of attorney, whereby the subscribers empowered three persons, therein named, to accept such terms, as the company should think fit to give them for their effects; which they alleged to be a mere trick, not one in a hundred of the subscribers having read the insnaring preamble.

“On the 10th of September, the directors caused the following advertisement to be published: ‘The court of directors give notice, that the dividends for Christmas next, and afterwards, voted by the general court on the 8th of September, which shall become due on the four money subscriptions, already taken for the sale of the stock of the company, will be allowed in part of the payments, which shall become due on the subscriptions; and that the 10 per cent. stock for the last Midsummer dividend, on the first, second, and third of the money subscriptions, will be entitled to the like dividends, and be allowed in further part of the payment on those subscriptions. And whereas the transfer-books of the company were advertised to be shut from the 31st of August last, to the 21st of September, in order to the making the subscriptions of 20 per cent. intended for the proprietors; and the general court having since agreed, that this subscription be omitted, the court of directors give notice, That the transfer-books will be opened on the 12th instant, and will continue open as usual.’

“Some of the managers vainly expected, that this advertisement would have contributed to the keeping up the stock; but, as it continued sinking, they were obliged to have recourse to more effectual methods. They made some secret advances towards an union with the East-India company; but, a secret committee of that company, appointed to consider of their offers, not having thought proper to accept them, they were forced to court the assistance of their rival, the Bank of England. At the earnest desire, and by the zealous interposition of Mr. Secretary Craggs, several conferences were held between a select number of the directors of those two corporations; which raised so great an expectation, that on the 12th of September,¹ in the morning, upon a report, that they had

¹ “Sept. 13. I came (as I told you I would) to towne, in order to adjust the matter of your Lottery tickets, pursuant to the advertisement of the South Sea company. Yesterday was the day appointed butt (as is customary with them) they have put it off, and those concerned are to wait their leisure, and take such satisfaction as they thinke fitt to give. Wee made them kings, and they deal with everybody as such; those whoe submit and subscribe are at their mercy; those whoe doe nott, are to be oppressed in such manner, as shall make what is due to them of little use; and all this, I suppose, they are to be supported in, having engaged the House of Commons soe far in their interest, by wayes obvious to everybody, that I thinke the nation will bee to beare such part of the losse sustained by private persons, as the company shall thinke fitt; whilst the gaine obtained by fraud and villainous practices, is to turne to their advantage. I foresaw this from the beginning, and have as many witnesses of itt, as persons I conversed with; but I owne, I thought they would have carryed on the cheat somewhat longer. Various are the conjectures why they suffered the cloud to break soe early, I made noe doubt butt ’twould doe soe when they found it for their advantage, which nott being

the case just att this time, some other reason must bee found; and the true one I take to bee, stretching credit soe far bey nd what ’twould beare, that specie proves deficient for supporting itt, by circulating paper. It is observable, that many of their most considerable men, with their fast friends, the tories, jacobites, and papist, (for these they have all along hugged) have drawne out, securing themselves by the losses of the deluded thoughtlesse numbers, whose understandings were over-ruled by avarice, and hopes of making mountains of mole hills. Thousands of families will be reduced to beggery, what the consequences of that will be, time must shew; I know what I thought from the beginning, and feare ’tis very near att hand. The consternation is inexpressible, the rage beyond expression, and the case so desperate, that I doe nott see any plan or scheme, so much as thought of, for averting the blow, soe that I can’t pretend to guesse att what is next to bee done.

“Sept. 27. The Company have yett come to noe determination, for they are in such a wood, that they know nott which way to turne, butt ’tis given out (I suppose by direction) that they will lower the price of the third and fourth subscriptions, and

come to an agreement for circulating six millions of the South-Sea company's bonds, the stock rose immediately to 670; but in the afternoon, as soon as that report was known to be groundless, the stock fell again to 580; the next day to 570, and so gradually to 400; which increased the murmurings and complaints of the last subscribers, and exposed several of the directors to public insults.

"Mr. Robert Walpole, who was paymaster of the army, and lived the greatest part of that summer in the country, to avoid giving offence to those that had, with the directors, the management of the South Sea affairs, being then thought to have great credit and influence with the Bank, was sent for out of the country, and importuned to use his interest to induce the Bank to agree to a Proposal made by the South Sea Company, for circulating a number of their bonds,

"It is to be observed that nothing of this kind arose from the Bank, or was at their motion; and, as far as it appears, nothing but an apprehension of the people's resentment, with which they were loudly threatened, could have prevailed with the Bank to have treated at all with the South Sea Company, and involve themselves in their calamities. But the clamour was irresistible, and the Bank, out of necessity, hearkened to the Proposals of the South Sea Company; for from them every step and motion proceeded.

offer more reasonable termes to the redeemables leaving to their option the acceptance, or returne of their severall securityes, these to remain on the foote they are, till discharged by payment in mouny; noe doubt att first they intended nothing lesse, but as Mr. Budgell told them in the generall court, since the mountain would nott come to Mahomet, hee must goe to the mountain. You misunderstood mee in thinking, I expected a speedy dissolution: that had been considered and lay'd aside, notwithstanding which, as earnest application was every where making, as if elections were to begin within a month, this was begun by the South Sea men, and great summes have they already spent, butt, if I mistake not, they will meet with more disappointments than they expected; for by several gentlemen, lately come to towne, I perceive the very name of a South Sea man, growe abominable in every country.

"Your remark is very just, that if this great Leviathan intended to have been directors of the whole national affairs, as well as of the company doe fall, it will necessarily occasion, such a convulsion, as noe honest man desires; but I think there remains a middle way between the two extremes, by supporting their credit, as far as in reason itt ought to bee supported, distinguishing between what ought properly to bee called credit, and chimericall calculations, and the one is certainly practicable, without running into the other. A great many goldsmiths are already gone of, and more will daily. I question whether one third, nay, a fourth can stand itt; the cause of which, is this, those whoe had either originally, or buying with mouny gott by taking differences, run into pretty considerable, quantityes of stock, nott being therewith content, butt resolving to sitt down with nothing lesse than hundred thousands, in order to obtaine which, gave vast premiums to the goldsmiths for mouny, pawning their stock some att four, others att five and six hundred, this being lookt upon as good as land security: the mouny thus lent by the goldsmiths was in cash notes, which whilst paper had credit, answered the end as well as specie; butt as soon as a run was upon them, they found (by reason of the stocks sinking) their pledges would not produce cash to

answer their notes, and thus one after another are they every day going of.

"From the very beginning, I founded my judgment of the whole affair upon this unquestionable maxim, that ten millions (which is more than our running cash) would not circulate two hundred millions, beyond which our paper credit extended; that therefore, when ever that should become doubtfull, bee the cause what itt would, our noble state machine must inevitably fall to the ground, or att best bee brought within soe much a narrower compass than what was projected, that our most sanguine people would find nothing more appositely expressive of their vain hopes than

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

"I endeavoured, with an honest and friendly intention, to persuade as many of my friends as I conversed with, to secure the main chance, and nott dip (at least) out of their depth, in case they should resolve to go with the current. Some few were prevailed upon by such arguments as I thought well founded, whose hearty thanks and acknowledgments I have receiv'd; butt the far greater part concluding (as I must own I did) that the thing would have been carryed on for some longer time, have on this supposition, run themselves aground, which they dearly repent: into this they were generally lead by assurances from the gent. whose nose bled, and whose himselfe was certainly duped by the honest directors from whom hee receiv'd information, whilst they were all the time (underhand) selling out as fast as they could. That hee was duped, I thinke past doubt, from his having by his influence, brought all his particular friends, and even his owne family and nearest relations, soe far into the mire, as that few of them will, during their lives, surmount the losse, others of them are soe totally undone, as to be beyond possibility of retrieving itt. Possibly, before the end of next session, I may bee called a South Sea man, for I shall nott join with those whose losses have soe far exasperated them, as to bee desirous, out of revenge to run into extremes, which may endanger the nation. Farewel."—Coxe's Walpole. Correspondence: Mr. Thomas Brodrick to lord Chancellor Middleton."

“The first expedient was for the Bank to circulate bonds of the South Sea Company to a certain value for a time to be agreed upon, and a proposal to that effect was, on the 16th of September, sent to the Bank by the Sub and Deputy Governors of the South Sea Company.

“This not being relished immediately it was proposed, that there should be a meeting of a Committee, consisting of five of each Company, at the post-master’s house, where were likewise present, lord president, Mr. Secretary Craggs, the chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Craggs, post-master-general.¹ The meeting was on the 19th of September, three days after the Proposal.

“This conference lasted many hours, with great reluctance on the part of the Bank, but was pressed with so much eagerness and authority on the other side, that the Bank was prevailed upon to yield.

“It was thought proper, before they parted, that something should be reduced into writing, as a minute of the substance of what had been under consideration, and to serve as a foundation of a future agreement or contract between the two companies.

“There was some little dispute who should draw the Minute, but it being the general desire of the company, that Mr. Walpole should do it, in the presence of the whole meeting, he put down in writing what has ever since been called, The Bank Contract, and which was in the following words: ‘That the Bank of England shall undertake to circulate three millions of South Sea bonds for one year, at a premium to be agreed upon by the two companies; a subscription to be taken, for enabling the Bank to carry on the circulation, — per cent. to be paid down by every subscriber, and — per cent. upon every call at a fortnight’s notice; the contract with the subscribers to be made in the nature and form with former contracts, for circulating Exchequer bills, and the charges of circulation to be borne by the South Sea company. That, in consideration of this undertaking the South Sea company shall pay the 3,700,000*l.* to be paid to the Bank, by notice of parliament, in South Sea stock, at a price to be agreed upon between the two companies.’

“This Paper, (which was all that Mr. Walpole ever wrote relating to the affair; for at the other meetings he was never once present) had no title or preamble, signifying what it imported: the premium for circulating, and what was to be paid down for the circulation, was left blank, and the most material part of the whole, at what price the Bank was to take the South Sea stock for 3,700,000*l.* was referred to a subsequent agreement. So it could not, with any propriety, be called a Contract, but rather a rough draught of an agreement, void of all form or any manner of obligation.

“The next day after this meeting (Sept. 20) there was a General Court of the South Sea Company, at Merchant-Taylor’s-hall, where Sir John Fellows, the sub-governor, acquainted them, ‘That, since their last meeting, their stock having taken an unexpected turn to the disadvantage of the company, the directors had been consulting what might be most for the benefit of the corporation; and considering the great credit the Bank of England had justly gained, both at home and abroad, they had thought it for their interest to treat with that company for the circulating their bonds, and to grant them stock at a moderate price in lieu of the 3,700,000*l.* which the South Sea Company was to pay them at Lady-day and Michaelmas, 1721. And that from the result of the meeting they had the night before with some gentlemen of the Bank, and some persons of the first rank, they doubted not but such an agreement might soon be perfected.’ Hereupon Mr. Dawson moved, ‘That the directors be empowered to agree with the Bank

¹ The five directors of South Sea were Sir John Fellows, sub-governor; Charles Joye, deputy-governor; Sir Theodore Jansen, Mr. Gore, Mr. Chester. The five Bank Directors were, Mr. Hanger, governor; Sir John Ward, Sir Gilbert Heathcote, Sir Peter Delme, Sir Nathaniel Gould.”

‘ of England, or any other persons, to circulate the company’s bonds, or make any other
 ‘ agreement with the Bank, which they should judge proper :’ and he was seconded by
 Sir John Eyles. Hereupon Mr. Hungerford moved for amending the latter part of the
 question, by making express mention of that other agreement. But Mr. Pulteney spoke
 for the question, and thought it best to use a latitude of expression, and so leave the
 directors at liberty to act as they should think proper for the interest of the company.
 He added, ‘ That it was a matter of surprise to see what a panic had seized upon the
 ‘ minds of the people, at a time when the nation was in profound peace, and had nothing
 ‘ to fear, either at home or from abroad. That, indeed, a rumour had been universally
 ‘ spread, as if the armament of the Spaniards was designed either against Port Mahon
 ‘ or Gibraltar; but that he took that report to be altogether false and groundless, and
 ‘ only intended to scandalize that potentate, and to terrify the people here; for he him-
 ‘ self had seen and perused a copy of a letter, written by the express command of the
 ‘ king of Spain by his secretary of state to the British minister at Madrid, absolutely
 ‘ denying, in the strongest terms, any designs of the Spanish forces against any of his
 ‘ Brittanic majesty’s dominions. That he was as much concerned in the company as
 ‘ most people, but that notwithstanding this general and terrible alarm, he had not dis-
 ‘ posed of any part of his stock; for he would think it a scandal to be rich, if the nation
 ‘ were ruined. That, however, he hoped the case would be quite otherwise; and he
 ‘ doubted not but the company would soon be restored to its former flourishing condition,
 ‘ since it was like to be supported by the Bank of England, a corporation, who by wise,
 ‘ though slow and cautious measures, had established its credit, not only at home, but
 ‘ even among foreigners.’ Upon this the question was unanimously agreed to. Sir
 John Fellows then farther acquainted the assembly, ‘ That, the proprietors of the several
 ‘ annuities lately subscribed, as well as those interested in the last two money-subscrip-
 ‘ tions, being very much dissatisfied, fearing thereby to be great losers, the directors had
 ‘ thought it proper, that the terms should be lowered to make them easy.’ Whereupon
 Sir Matthew Decker moved, ‘ That power be given to the directors to relieve the
 ‘ annuitants, who came in upon the last subscription: as likewise the proprietors of the
 ‘ third and fourth money subscriptions.’ He was seconded by Mr. Craggs, senior, who
 among other things, said, ‘ That nothing could be more reasonable and just, than to give
 ‘ satisfaction to people who had trusted their fortunes and estates with the company, and
 ‘ that it would be a notorious robbery to take any advantage of their confidence in the
 ‘ honour and integrity of the directors.’ This gave occasion to Mr. Budgel¹ to reflect
 in a speech, on the prodigious leap, from a subscription of 400*l.* to one of 1,000*l.* which
 left such a gap in the building, as would at last bring it to the ground. He then observed,
 that the fall of the stock was owing to the malicious rumour, that two or three of the
 very directors had basely betrayed the trust reposed in them. When he had done

1 “ This is the Eustace Budgel alluded to by Pope.
 “ ‘ Thrice Budgel aim’d to speak, but thrice suppress
 “ ‘ By potent Arthur, knocked his chin and breast.’

“ Again,

“ ‘ Let Budgel charge low Grub-Street on his quill,
 “ ‘ And write whate’er he pleased, except his Will.’

“ ‘ The last line alludes to Tindal’s Will; by which,
 and other indirect practices, Budgel, to the exclusion
 of the next heir, a nephew, got to himself almost the
 whole fortune of a man entirely unrelated to him.
 Respecting the circumstance hinted at, of Eustace
 Budgel having forged Dr. Tindal’s Will, the reader
 might perhaps wish to have some further account.
 Dr. Tindal, of All Souls College, Oxford, of notorious
 character, the Author of Christianity as old as the
 Creation, left the following Will, ‘ I Matthew Tindal,

‘ &c. (after a legacy to his maid-servant) give and
 ‘ bequeath to Eustace Budgel, the sum of two thou-
 ‘ sand one hundred pounds, that his great talents
 ‘ may serve his country, &c. my strong box, my
 ‘ diamond ring, MS. books, &c. (Signed) Mat. Tin-
 ‘ dal.’

“ ‘ The reverend Nicholas Tindal, his nephew-
 author of the Continuation of Rapin, declared
 his suspicion that this Will was forged. This
 was generally credited, and Budgel, in 1737, threw
 himself out of a boat and was drowned. He wrote
 several of the Spectators; the History of the Boyles,
 earls of Shannon, &c. and a weekly pamphlet called
 the Bee. The cause of his death was supposed to
 have been in relation to this Will.’ Pope’s Works,
 vol. 4, p. 62. Bowles, Edit. 1806.”

speaking, Mr. Chester, one of the directors, spoke in vindication of his brethren, and said, 'That he knew of no proceedings among them, but what were intended for the good of the whole company; that for his own part, he had not sold any of his stock, nor reserved to himself any more of the subscriptions than what was allowed to each of the directors; and that his fortune would have been as large, if he had not been a director; that as to the great gap between the second and third subscription, in money, which was objected as a wrong step in the management of the company's affairs, he could assure them, that it was none of the directors' fault, since they designed to have made the third subscription at five or six hundred; but, the humour and eagerness of the people having run up the South Sea stock to seven or eight hundred, they could not in prudence open a subscription at less than a thousand.' The assembly seemed to be very well pleased with Mr. Chester's speech; but many wondered, that none of his brethren took that opportunity to clear themselves, as he had done. Upon the whole matter, the court unanimously agreed to the question for relieving the last subscribers, and then adjourned.

"Two days after, Sept. 22, there was a General Court of the Bank of England, when the governor acquainted them, that this was one of their quarterly and half yearly meetings, and that their directors had come to a resolution to declare the last half-yearly dividend at four per cent; to which the court having unanimously agreed, the governor proceeded, saying, 'He presumed, none could be ignorant there had of late been divers meetings and conferences between the directors of this company and the directors of the South Sea, under the influence and interposition of some persons of the highest figure and station: that they had made no agreement yet with the South Sea; but that the directors had thought fit to come to a resolution upon the matter.' Then the resolution was read; and, without any person's speaking to it, was immediately formed into a question to this effect; 'That, for the better support of the public credit, the directors of the Bank of England be empowered to agree with the directors of the South Sea, to circulate their bonds to what sum, and upon what terms, and for what time, they shall think proper; and to make what other agreements with the South Sea, they shall judge to be for the interest of this corporation:' which question was instantly agreed to with great unanimity. Then the Governor acquainted them, that he believed books would be ready for a subscription to be taken in, the next day, for the purpose aforesaid, and that it would be on the usual terms, 15*l.* per cent. deposit, and 3*l.* per cent. premium, and 5*l.* per cent. interest, and then the court adjourned.

"The Directors of the two Companies being thus empowered, a Committee of both met on the 23d of September, and a Proposal was made by one of the directors of the South Sea Company, 'That the 8,700,000*l.* (which the South Sea Company was to repay to the Bank at Lady-day, and Michaelmas 1721) should be subscribed by the Bank into the stock of the South Sea Company, for which the Bank was to have such shares as the funds would produce, the stock being valued at 400*l.* per cent.'

"This Proposal was the next day reported at a court of the directors of the Bank; and, being agreed to, was the same day communicated, by a director of the Bank, to the court of directors of the South Sea Company.

"This, in short, is the History of the famous Bank Contract, which has made so much noise. The substance of all which is, that, in the day of distress, the Bank was thought the only resource to support the sinking state of the South Sea Company. Every one that was thought capable of giving any assistance was called in: at the first conference Mr. Walpole assisted, and the Bank was persuaded to undertake what was proposed to them; the first part of the proposition, and, indeed, the original proposal for circulating the bonds, upon which the first conference was held, was dropped by the South Sea

Company; and the last article of taking South Sea stock at 400*l.* per cent. was carried on and accepted by a committee of the Bank: and this example, it was hoped, by the managers of the South Sea affairs, would fix the price of South Sea stock at that rate; but they were soon convinced by the daily fall of the stock, that this expedient would not answer; and the Bank quickly found, they had been prevailed upon to consent to what they were not able to perform, as will presently be seen.

“ When the Books were opened at the Bank, for taking in a subscription for the support of public credit, the concourse of people, who readily brought in their money, was at first so very great, that it was judged the whole subscription, (which was intended for three millions) would have been filled that very day: but it happened, that the fall of the South Sea stock, and the discredit of that company’s bonds, occasioned a run upon the most eminent goldsmiths and bankers, some of whom having lent out great sums upon South Sea stock, and other public securities, were obliged to shut up their shops and abscond. The Sword Blade Company (who hitherto had been the chief cash-keepers of the South Sea Company) being almost drained of their ready money, were forced to stop payment, and set up at their office written bills, giving notice, ‘ That they would pay ‘ any part of their notes in South Sea stock at 400*l.* per cent. or pay part in cash on the ‘ Monday following, and give five per cent. interest on the rest till paid; and that they would take their own notes in payment of the monies they had lent.’ This, being looked upon as a kind of Bankruptcy, increased the public calamity, and occasioned a great run upon the Bank, who were obliged to pay out money faster than they received it upon the subscription. But the festival of Michaelmas, on which the Bank was shut of course, gave it some breathing time.

“ In the mean time, South Sea Stock continued sinking till Michaelmas-Day, when it was about 150, at which price it was on the 2d of February, the day after the House of Commons accepted the Proposals of the South Sea Company, whose low credit appeared yet more plainly, in that their bonds, payable on Michaelmas 1721, were now at above 25*l.* per cent. discount.

“ Pursuant to a former Resolution for relieving the last subscribers, a general court was held the 30th of September, wherein, after the agreement with the Bank was ratified, it was resolved that the proprietors of the redeemable debts, taken in on the last subscriptions, should be allowed, for their several interests in the funds, the same terms, in all respects, as the Bank; and that the last subscription of the Long Annuities should be valued at 32 years’ purchase; and of the Short at 47 years’ purchase; ¹ to be paid for in stock at 400 per cent. and be entitled to the last Midsummer dividend: And that all the Annuitants should be allowed the interest of their annuities to the 29th of September. It was also agreed, that the third subscription, which was taken at 1000 per cent. should be reduced to 400 per cent. and the subscription receipts given out accordingly. That the 100 per cent. already paid, should be taken in part of the payment; and that the remaining 300 per cent. should be paid in nine payments, whereof the next three pay-

1 “ It may not be improper to insert here an Account of the Long and Short Annuities, subscribed or unsubscribed.

	£.	s.	d.			
Long Annuities, per ann.	866,821	3	3	Second subscription	13,753	0 0
First subscription	427,240	18	9	Unsubscribed	14,118	0 0
Second subscription	125,302	17	6			
Unsubscribed	114,077	12	0	Lottery Annuities, 1710	45,260	6 1
				First subscription	13,913	4 0
Short Annuities, per ann.	81,000	0	0	Second subscription	11,906	6 0
First subscription	43,132	0	4	Unsubscribed	15,385	16 1
				Redeemables	16,546,432	7 1
				Subscribed	14,391,731	8 0
				Unsubscribed	2,152,691	7 1

ments to be at 40 per cent. each, and the other six payments at 30 per cent. at six months' distance from each other; the first payment of 40 per cent. to be the 2d of July 1721. It was also agreed, that the fourth subscription, which was taken at 1000 per cent. whereof 200 per cent. was paid down, should be also reduced to 400 per cent. and that the remaining 200 per cent. should be paid in eight equal payments of 25 per cent. each, the first of which was to be the 26th of September, 1721, and the remaining payments, at six months' distance from each other. That interest should be allowed to the company from Michaelmas, 1720, after the rate of 5 per cent. per ann. to the respective times of payment of the said third and fourth subscriptions: And that the 10 per cent. dividend at Midsummer, should be also allowed on the third and fourth subscriptions. That the proprietors of the receipts of all the money subscriptions, should be allowed, in part of their payments, the several dividends that should be made on the stock of the company, till their payments were completed. That five per cent. interest be allowed on all the company's bonds from the 29th instant till they should become due; and that any of the company's bonds should be taken as money in the fourth payment of the first subscription, which would become due on the 14th of October.

“ These Resolutions gave no satisfaction to the Annuitants, nor put the least stop to the fall of the South Sea Stock. The Bank finding they were not able to stem the tide, without exposing the properties of their own principals and adventurers to be carried away and lost in the common deluge, they wisely kept themselves out of the general inundation, and did not care to be drowned with those they could not save. They resolved to drop an agreement, which they were under no obligation to perform (had it been possible) and to which the South Sea had no power to compel them. On the 10th of November, the governor of the Bank reported from the Committee, appointed to treat with the South Sea Company, that the transactions between the Bank and that Company had been laid before council, on behalf of the Bank; and that, the South Sea Company pressing for an answer of what had been done therein, the governor of the Bank had acquainted the deputy governor of the South Sea Company, that the Committee did not think fit, for the present, to proceed further in that affair, and had delivered to him in writing the following Answer.

“ ‘ When the proposition was offered by the lords, at the meeting of the Committees of both Companies, as a suitable expedient for the support of public credit, the court of directors of the Bank showed their readiness to join in any measures, that might tend to the service of the public.

“ ‘ But, some difficulties appearing to the Committee of the Bank, they have consulted with their council, and they are advised, that considering the nature of this transaction, it will not be safe for them to proceed upon the proposition without consent of parliament. However, they think it reasonable, that, in the mean time, the Committee of the South Sea should give the Committee of the Bank some account of their estate, for the satisfaction of their principals.’

“ About a week after, the following paper was sent to the Bank from the Lords of the Treasury: ‘ My lords desire, that the difficulties which have arisen (and upon which, they say, they have consulted their own council) concerning the late agreement between them and the South Sea Company, may be put in writing, and delivered to their lordships, as soon as possible, that their lordships may receive the opinion of the king's council.’

“ To this the following Answer was given: ‘ The Court of Directors of the Bank have, with the utmost deference, considered the message in writing, which your lordships were pleased to send them, and they humbly apprehend, they cannot better explain themselves, than they have already done, in the manner they have given to the South

‘ Sea Company, a copy whereof was delivered to your lordships, which contains the substance of what they consulted with their council thereupon.’

“ Thus ended the transactions between the two Companies, which (as it has been suggested) were carried on by the authors and promoters of them, with a design to take advantage of the first rumour of this supposed agreement, and draw in unwary persons, who desirous to retrieve their losses, were induced to buy stock at the price the Bank had agreed to take it. Those who had countenanced and run into every part of the South Sea Scheme, and were consequently deeply involved, were justly suspected of having contrived and taken advantage of the contract, by which means great numbers of deluded people were undone.

“ Thus, in the space of eight months, were seen the rise, progress, and fall, of that mighty fabric, which, being wound up by mysterious springs to a wonderful height, had fixed the eyes and expectations of all Europe, but whose foundation being fraud, illusion, credulity and infatuation, fell to the ground, as soon as the artful management of the projectors was discovered. The ebb of this swoln fluctuating credit returned with greater violence than it flowed, and carried everything before it with that precipitation, that the application of the ministers of state, and the directors of the great companies jointly and separately to stop it, were ineffectual. Express after express was sent to Hanover, to give the king information of the state of affairs, which was so urgent, that the king set out for England sooner than he intended, and arrived at London the 11th of November.

“ The South Sea stock, which was 200 at the king’s arrival, fell again upon the prorogation of the parliament, from the 25th of November to the 8th of December, to 135; but, on a report that the ministry had agreed with the principal directors of the South Sea, the Bank, and the East India Company, upon a project which would very much conduce to the restoration of the public credit, it rose again to 210.”

H.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WOMAN, AS WOMAN.¹

The following confidential communication of Sir Robert Walpole to the Queen of Geo. II., (1734) is taken from the Memoirs of Geo. II. by John, Lord Hervey.² The reader will observe that the principle indicated in the title of this chapter is fully recognized by Sir Robert in his frank admissions to the Queen.

“ Sir Robert Walpole used always to go into Norfolk twice in a year, for ten days in the summer and twenty in November, and generally set out for his second expedition the day after the King’s birth-day; he was to do so now, and therefore to take his leave this evening of the Queen. Between six and seven he went up to her from Lord Hervey’s lodgings, and stayed there nearly two hours. After inquiring much after the state of her health, and finding it very indifferent, he entreated her to take care of herself, and told her, ‘ Madam, your life is of such consequence to your husband, to your children, to this country, and indeed to many other countries, that any neglect of your health is really

¹ p. 540.

² VOL. I, p. 414.

the greatest immorality you can be guilty of: when one says these sort of things in general to princes, I know, Madam, they must sound like flattery; but consider particular circumstances, and your Majesty will quickly find what I say to be strictly true. Your Majesty knows that this country is entirely in your hands—that the fondness the King has for you, the opinion he has of your affection, and the regard he has for your judgment, are the only reins by which it is possible to restrain the natural violence of his temper, or to guide him to any part where he is wanted to go. Should any accident happen to your Majesty, who can tell into what hands he would fall—who can tell what would become of him, of your children, and of us all? Some woman, your Majesty knows, would govern him; for the company of men he cannot bear. Who knows what that woman would be? She might be avaricious; she might be profuse; she might be ambitious; she might, instead of extricating him out of many difficulties (like her predecessor), lead him into many, and add those of her own indiscretions to his: perhaps, from interested views for herself and her own children (if she happened to have any), or from the natural and almost universal hatred that second marriages bear to all the consequences of a first, she might blow up the father against the son; irritate the son against the father, the brothers against one another; and might add to this the ill treatment and oppression of the sisters, who, with their youth and bloom worn off, without husbands, without fortunes, without friends, and without a mother, might, with all the éclat of their birth and the grandeur of their education, end their lives as much objects of pity as they began them objects of envy. To these divisions in the palace, the natural consequences would be divisions in the kingdom: and what the consequences of those would be, it is much more terrible to think of than difficult to foresee.’

“The Queen wept extremely while Sir Robert was speaking to her, and then answered in this manner:—‘Your partiality to me, my good Sir Robert, makes you see many more advantages in having me, and apprehend many greater dangers from losing me, than are indeed the effects of the one, or than would be the consequences of the other. That the King would marry again, if I died, I believe is sure, and I have often advised him so to do; but his good sense, and his affection for his family, would put a stop to any such attempts as you speak of in a second wife, or at least would prevent their coming to the height you describe; and as for his political government, he has now such a love for you, and so just a value for your services, as well as such an opinion of your abilities, that, were I removed, everything would go on just as it does. You have saved us from many errors, and this very year have forced us into safety, whether we would or no, against our opinion and against our inclination. The King sees this, and I own it; whilst you have fixed yourself as strongly in favor by an obstinate and wise contradiction to your Prince, as ever any other minister did by the blindest and most servile compliance.’

“Sir Robert thanked her extremely for all her goodness and kind thoughts of him: ‘But you know, Madam, (said he) I can do nothing without you; whatever my industry and watchfulness for your interest and welfare suggest, it is you must execute: you, Madam, are the sole mover of this Court; whenever your hand stops, everything must stand still, and, whenever that spring is changed, the whole system and every inferior wheel must be changed too. If I can boast of any success in carrying on the King’s affairs, it is a success, I am very free to own, I never could have had but by the mediation of your Majesty; for if I have had the merit of giving any good advice to the King, all the merit of making him take it, Madam, is entirely your own; and so much so that I not only never did do anything without you, but I know I never could; and if this country have the misfortune to lose your Majesty, I should find it as impossible divested of your assistance, to persuade the King into any measure he did not like, as, whilst we have the happiness of possessing your Majesty, any minister would find it to persuade him into a step which you did not approve.’”

These are startling confessions for a statesman of a great nation to make. The Queen adopts and follows his counsel, and influences the King, not because it is the judgment of the minister,—but because it is transmitted by the woman he professes to love. The medium of communication is made paramount to principle—thus constantly endangering the great interests of state by the chance employment of irresponsible or disreputable agents of royal favor. It is possible that in admitting so much, Walpole saw the means of his continuance in power. Whatever may have been his motives, in such extreme concessions, it is quite certain that he furnished no evidence that royalty itself afforded any security to the people.

I.

EARLY SETTLEMENT OF CONNECTICUT. · CHARACTER OF THE SETTLERS.

The author is indebted to a distinguished gentleman of Connecticut for the following statements, extracts taken from a letter. They are inserted that the subject may receive further attention, and the truths of history be established.

“The Connecticut Colony was commenced at Windsor and Hartford in 1634-5, by Haynes, Hooker and their associates. The settlement at Quinnipiac, or New Haven, was commenced some four or five years later.” * * *

“The two colonies had different origins and founders and entirely distinct governments, for about a quarter of a century, when Winthrop, in 1662, procured the charter which consolidated them, and *annexed* Quinnipiac to Connecticut, much against the will and wishes of many of the prominent men in the Quinnipiac colony.

“This is partly explained in a note (of this book) on page 277. The towns on the Connecticut were not under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts until 1639, although the latter state assumed that the emigrants, if they left, must continue her jurisdiction. But Connecticut did not acknowledge, or acquiesce in the assumption, but held their own courts, enacted their own laws, and were wholly independent of Massachusetts. The records and journals of the courts, elections and appointments make no reference to Massachusetts, and those Connecticut records were three or four years before the settlement of Quinnipiac.” * * *

“The people of Connecticut first settled in the different places, but they assembled and formed their own constitution, or ordinances of civil government in January 1638-9. It is the first written constitution of a people, and made by the people themselves. It was not a crown grant, nor proprietor's grant, nor a Massachusetts' grant, but a civil compact made by the people themselves for their own government. The general prin-

ciples of the Ordinance of 1638, were incorporated into the Charter obtained by Winthrop from Charles the Second in 1662, and were embodied into the constitution under which we live.

“Connecticut was from the beginning democratic. She always elected her own governors and magistrates, appointed her own judges, and, in all state, or colonial matters, acted wholly independent of the crown, to which, however, she was loyal. In these respects, she occupied an entirely different position from all the other colonies, before the Revolution, and the opposition to central aggressive power, which influenced the settlers, animates their descendants not only here, but wherever they are located.

“Massachusetts’ historians and writers have never done full justice to Connecticut. Even Hildreth and Bancroft are disposed to make it an appendage to Massachusetts, whereas, there were from the first distinctive differences in many respects, both ecclesiastical and civil.”

INDEX.

A

- Abimelech, "a hold bad man," 531.
 Abstraction, a world of, 284.
 Acherley, Roger, writings of, 332.
 Achilles, rage of, 35.
 Acosta, discoveries of, 11.
 Adams, John, 84, 145; Rights of Colonization, 112; and Oglethorpe, 208; quoted, 309; monarchs he respected, "no king-killer," 332.
 Adams, John Quincy, respecting party names, 18; May Flower Compact, 115.
 Adams, Samuel, 84, 300; respecting government, 301; respecting British Constitution, 319; "Farmers' Letters," 327; republicanism, 342.
 Addison, Joseph, respecting political parties, 2; description of the Tory, 19; democracy in England, 77; views of party, 511; his democracy, 511; and Steele, difference between, 523; difference lamented by Dr. Johnson, 523; Sir Robert Walpole respecting, 523; Tory Creed, Appendix, 617; "After-wise" party, 5.
 Administration and government, difference between, 314.
 Affections, the uncertainties of in royalty, 521; alienation of the, 566.
 Africa, field of conquest, 95; coast of, 189.
 After-wise-party, spoken of by Addison, 5.
 Age, every, has its appropriate characters, 63; of sin and degradation, 309.
 Agriculture, knowledge of, derived by the Greeks from Egyptians and Phœnicians, 94.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, peace of, 568.
 Alexander, the great, 81, 134, 370.
 Alfred, of England, 134; the greatest king, 370.
 Algiers, galley slaves' prison at, 6.
 Allen, Samuel, governor, 203.
 Allen, William, "What is democracy?" 23.
 All things double, quotation from Bible, 1.
 Ambition, and incapacity, 522.
 America, discovery of, 96; Columbus, 111; Continent of, 144.
 American Colonies, 87; Colonists, 119; growth of, 159; education of, 293.
 American Revolution, 248; inspired new hopes, 336; study of, 345; causes of, 612; history of, 615.
 Americans, disobedient spirit of, 203, rebels, list of, 328; prepared for freedom, 344.
 Ammonites, prophecies against, 5.
 Amyraut, Moses, Preceptor of Wm. Penn, 233.
 Anarchy, fruit of ignorance, 25.
 Andros, Sir Edmund, 202, 277, 285.
 Angels, rebellious, 5.
 Angelo, 13.
 Anglo-Saxons, and the Cross, 82.
 Animals, of the tardigrade family, 558.
 Animalcula, invisible to the eye, 288.
 Anne, Queen, 441; age, capacity and prejudices, 442; church tory, 443; party prejudices, 443; sense of decorum, 443; anecdote of, 443; "entirely English," 443; interference with elections, 444; tory appointments, 445; second marriage proposed to, 447; reverence for the church, 455; counsellors, 455; respecting dear "Mrs. Freeman," 469; Queen Sarah, 471; questions discussed, 497; "Mrs. Morley," 500; sources of her troubles, 503; death of, ended the Stuart Line, 504; Buckle's view of, 504; relieved by death, 505; reign of, review, 505; seventeen times pregnant, 533.
 Ante-Columbian discoveries, 96.
 Antinomian controversy, 161.
 Arabian scholarship, 134.
 Arago, curious fact stated by, 6.
 Archimedes, 83.
 Argyll, duke of, in council, 510.
 Aristocracy, element of, 200.
 Aristotle, saying of, 35; human progress, 239; quoted, 317; respecting monarchy, 324; woman, 483.
 Arch-bishop of Canterbury, 383.
 Arkwright, knowledge of, 1.
 Army, of Cromwell, 58; standing, dangerous, 166; commander of, difficulties, 501; motion to reduce, 548; extent of the British, 548.
 Aspasia, her character, 482.
 Association, for aiding Wm. of Orange, 421.
 Astronomer, an undevout, 85.
 Astronomy, in China, 288.
 Athens, people of, 35, 37.
 Athenians, how ruled, 483.
 Atterbury, bishop of, leader of Jacobites, 529.
 Austria, people of, not free, 41.
 Author of this work, his aim and end, 73.

Authority, fixed boundaries of, 292.
Auxilliary, Whigs and Tories, 528.

B

Babes, spirit of, 3.
Bacon, Lord, pioneer of knowledge, 89, 461, nuptial love, 488.
Bancroft, George, quoted, 60, 166, 174, 176, 192, 201, 203, 220, 221, 223, 224, 227, 231, 234, 236, 238, 244, 248, 262, 276, 279, 282, 332.
Barbarism, its meaning, 53.
Baltimore, Lord, 219, and Wm. Penn, 231.
Barclay, popular power, 239, quoted, 242.
Barnard, Sir John, against military rule, 550.
Barillon, letters of, 380, 381, at the palace, 383, minister of Louis XIV, letters, 405.
Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, 243.
Barré, Col. Isaac, Lord North rebuked, 21, 77.
Barstow, Hist. of N. H., quoted, 202.
Baxter, Richard, works of, 57, Bunyan and Howe, 405, under trial, 407, defence, 407, insulted by Jeffreys, 407.
Bathurst, Lord, defends freedom against sumptuary laws, 550.
Beasts and Birds, instincts of, 312.
Beauty, domain of, 479.
Beethoven, 13.
Belgic sires, sons of, 201.
Bell, Sir Charles, respecting the Sloth, 550.
Benedictines, of Italy, 82.
Benevolence, parsimonious, 217.
Berkley, Lord, 201, 235.
Bible Societies, 9.
Bible, respecting parties, 1, 4; quoted, 23, 24, 42; democracy of, 83; in Russia, 84, 118; Colonization, 95; above Parliament, 110; town governments, 124; laws of, 140; government of Puritans, 140; Christianity, 240; respecting kings, 309; against monarchy, 333, 4.
Bigotry, nature of, 161.
Bill of Rights, 439.
Biography, in two words, 127.
Birch, Col. M. P., on Exclusion Bill, 392.
"Birds of a feather, flock together," 369.
Birmingham, Club of, 619.
Bishop of London, threatens Wm. Penn, 233; Dissenters, 445.
Bishop Burnet, respecting the Quakers, 241; in Holland, 420.
Bishops, trial of, 417.
Blackstone, studied in America, 293.
Bodin, against knowledge in a king, 460.
Boetie, democracy of, p. 49.
Bolingbroke, spirit of liberty, 25; quoted, 159, 315; Whig and Tory, 385; influence of, 444; young and ambitious, 446; as an adviser, 456; and Harley, 503; and Oxford, 510; a Deist, 513; announces the death of the Tory party, 526; respecting political parties, 527; employs women, 527; not easily discouraged, 528; his lament, 528; his death, 579; character, 584.
Bradford, Gov., his property, 127.
Bradlaugh, Charles, republicanism of, 75.
"Brave before God, coward before man," (from Montaigne,) 383.
Bramble, chosen King, 531.
Bread, a patent for making, 99.
Breda, declaration from, 360.

Boone, Daniel, 90.
Boston, date of settlement, 277.
Botta, quoted, 299.
Bozman, quoted, 220, 221, 226.
Brewster, William, and others, 142.
Bribery, shameless, 379, 386; bill against, 545.
Britain, "an island fertile in usurpers," 55.
British Constitution, glory of, 300, 318; conventional, 318; Hallam, respecting, 319; Samuel Adams, respecting, 319; glory of, 320; democracy of, 320; Bolingbroke, respecting, 320, 21; growth of, 321; derided, 322; What it is, 322; and republicanism, 343; experience of England, 346; government controversies, 281.
British realm, limits of, 298.
Britons, A. D., 36, 54.
"Broad-bottomed administration," 579.
Brooklyn, 188.
Brougham, Lord, soldier and schoolmaster, 24; colonial affairs, 95; quoted, 124, 308, 310, 312; monarchy, 325.
Brotherly love, in government, 231.
Brunswick, house of, and the Whigs, 605.
Bubbles, time of Geo. I., 14; list of, 525, 643; lines respecting, 646.
Buchanan, George, birth and character, 57, 77.
Buckle, Thomas, quoted, 308, 310; Prince of Orange, 429; Queen Anne, 504.
Buddhism, 13.
Burgoyne, Gen., to Pitt, 614.
Burke, Edmund, quoted, 4; and Fox, breach between, 4; Lord North, 20, 77; quoted, 293, 303; against politics in the pulpit, 365; republics, 389; "interior cabinet," 593.
Burns, Robert, land of, 203.
Burton, Robert, Parties, 6; what he saw to laugh at, 488.
Business, basis of,—3.
Bute, Earl of, why appointed, 594; Pitt and the King, 599; person and character, 600; anecdote of 600, 603; lofty ignorance, 600; hated, 601; caricatured, 601; desperate cabal of, 601; admirers of, 602; praised by Smollett, 603; his appointments, 605; resignation of, 606; and Pitt, 607, 608.
Butts, Isaac, of N. Y., quoted, 303.
Byllinge, Edward, 235.
Byron, Lord, self-denial of, 461.

C

Cabal, history of, 368.
Calef, Dr. John, 290.
Calvert, Cecilius, 219.
Calvert, Charles, 228; family and Maryland, 220; Sir George, Catholic statesman, 220, 222; Geo. H., quoted, 311.
Calvin, John, 240.
Calvinism, exiles from the seats of, 98.
Cambridge, Mass., date of settlement, 277.
Camden, Lord, 77; wisdom of, 572.
Canning, on sedition, 338.
Canute, commands the sea, 54.
Cape Cod, 143.
Capell, Lord, and Charles I., 348.
Carolina, divided, 187.
Carolinas, people of, 188.
Carteret, Sir Geo., 201, 235.
Carthaginians, Colonies of, 95.

- Cartwright, British Constitution, 319.
 Cass, Lewis Jr., Rome, 84.
 Catholicism and Protestantism, 225; in England, 362; and democracy, 421.
 "Cato," signature of Dr. Smith, 332.
 Cattell, Ch. C., republicanism of, 75; quoted, 619.
 Caucus, its use and abuse, 514.
 Cause and effect, in political philosophy, 569.
 Cavalier, and Puritan, in S. C., 183.
 Cavaliers, alarmed, 366.
 Cæsar, littleness of, 43; conquers Briton, 55.
 Celestial Empire, ignorance of, 120; hemisphere, phenomena of, 288.
 Central power, will of, 316.
 Century, the events of a, 108.
 Centuries, grand results of, 377.
 Chalmers, monarchy, 73; quoted, 176, 188, 220, 222; a Tory, 264; quoted, 437.
 Charlemagne, reign of, 48, 82.
 Charles I., death warrant of, 59; respecting, 176, 178, 207, 228, 229; declaration of, 324.
 Charles II., 189, 207, 221, 228, 229; made king, 356; character, 356; and Cromwell, compared, 357; popular, 357; a profligate, 358; base habits of, 359, 366; hated business, 359; false to promises, 360; ready to trade, 361; how surrounded, 362; at Whitehall, 366; last parliament of, 372; criminality of, 376; degradation of, 378; bribery, 379; relations with parliament, 380; with Louis XIV., 378; ceased to be merry, 382; life and death, 383; death-bed scene, 382, '3; a Catholic, 383; contempt for divine things, 383; guilt of, and Priest at back door, 384; rumored causes of his death, 384; reign of, reviewed, 385, 393; tory reign of, 386; respecting Mary's marriage, 420; Wm. Penn, 281, 233; commissioners of, 233.
 Character, formation of, 121.
 Charity, great experiment of, 206; true, 262.
 Charter, to Mass. 1628, 123; of Liberties, N. Y., 201; of Conn. demanded, 233; hidden 286.
 Charter governments, 152; of N. E., 277.
 Charters, new and amended, 271.
 Chatham, Lord, respecting parties, 15; Geo. Buchanan, 57; fall-up-stairs, 74, 77; did not see greatness of America, 461; quoted, 462; legacy to, 491; called upon by Fox, 580; only conditions of service, 581; character by Cooke, 583; Cooke's opinions reviewed, 583; man of genius and a democrat, 583; relations with Bute, 603; character, 603; appointment and resignation, 603, 604; and the king, 607, '9, 610; nothing impossible to, 614; devoted wife of, 614; great influence of, 614; where best known, 614.
 Chesterfield, Earl of, 206.
 Chevallier, Madame, origin and character, 485.
 Child, Sir Josiah, M. P., subject of Interest, 553.
 Children, taught to be partizans, 2, 3.
 China, religion of, 7; 2000 years ago, 30; study of, 82; Emperors of, and Deity, 82; vessels of, 288; government of, 310, 313; writings of Confucius, 312; Emperor and Ministers, 315.
 Christian rule, 309.
 Christian theory, and anti-Christian practice, 556.
 Christianity, doctrines of, 6; blessings of, 9; a revolution, 45; leaders of, 79; sublime requisitions of, 95; in Georgia, 212; extension of, 223; teachings of, 292.
 Church, divided, 308; recognition of, 322; and state, 331; detached from state, 362; in confusion, 363; and the crown, 371, 403; the laity, 371; Infallibility of, 412; fears and prayers of, 414; favored by the Tories, 414; outrage upon, 417; perils of, 512; dependence of, 530; and royalty saved by democracy, 585.
 "Church Party," 443.
 "Church in danger," cry of, p. 446, 555.
 Cicero, death of, 42; religion, 80; love of glory, 461.
 Ciphers, "great many to follow," 348, power of, 533.
 Circumstances, combination of, 532.
 Cities, large, democratic, p. 394.
 Civil power, sources of, 168; defined, 279.
 Civilization, impulses, 97; germs of, 288.
 Clarendon, Lord, quoted, 360; character of, 363; impeachment of, 367.
 Clarkson, Life of Penn, 235.
 Clayborne, Capt. Wm., 219.
 Clergy, in the dark ages, 83; power lessened, 365; made war on schism, 366; and royalty, 433.
 Clubs, political, in England, 336.
 Cobbler, drunken, for the church, 2.
 Coalition, unholy, 205; political, fate of, 576, 578.
 Cobden, Richard, quoted, 623.
 Coddington, William, 278.
 Codrus, obscure age of, 288.
 Coercion, theory of, favored by James II., 406.
 Colonial events, survey of, 102.
 Colonial governments, 151.
 Colonial policy, continental, 281.
 Colonial success, sources of, 171.
 Colonies, ancient and modern, 92; N. America, 95; origin, 96, 101; general survey of, 109; dates of settlement, 151; foreign control of, 165; defence of, 231; political importance of, 286; independence of, 343; government of, 333.
 Colonists, working men, 120; habits of, 120; hard terms, 129; true to their Charters, 130; austerity of, 130; religionists, 281; servants of God, 282; respecting monarchy, 331; pride of, 343.
 Colonization, principles of, 89.
 Columbus, spirit of, 83, 89, 93; preceded by the Northmen, 291.
 Combe, George, quoted, 293.
 Commissioners appointed by the King, 283; resisted, 284.
 Commodus, his ambition, 42.
 Commons, zealous for royalty, 364.
 Common sense, rare quality, 114.
 Commonwealth, of Cromwell, 328, 347.
 Compact, of the Mayflower, 113; signatures, 114; J. Q. Adams, respecting, 115.
 Compton, Sir Spencer, 539; and Walpole, as competitors, 539.
 Conditions and Concessions, of Wm. Penn, 245.
 Condorcet, a democrat from philosophy, 22.
 Conformists, and non-conformists, 433.

- Confucius, teachings of, 8; writings, 312.
 Connecticut, territory of, 277; charter of, 277, 279; fathers of, 279; early settlement of, 660.
 Conscience, terrors of, 383.
 Conservative principle, 159.
 Constitution, ancient, 69; British, 300; and the government, 316; written or conventional, 313.
 Consolidation, fears of, 279.
 Contest, for the greatest liberty, 117.
 Conventional conflict, and action, 297.
 Coode, John, 229.
 Cooke, Geo. Wingrove, Hist. of Party, 362, '5, '7; quoted, 373, 387; parties, 385; quoted, 416, 436, 437, 442, 453; his character of Pitt reviewed, 583, 584.
 Cooper, Peter, quoted, 340.
 Copenhagen house, meeting at, 338.
 Copernicus, heresy of, 10.
 Copley, Sir Lionel, 219.
 Coriolanus, Caius Marcius, 483, 630.
 Cortéz, found parties in Mexico, 5; spirit of, 83.
 Council of Safety, 277.
 Counsel, stability of, 292.
 Country, true love of, 16.
 Courts of High Commission, 157, 405.
 Courts, rival, of royalty, 566.
 Covenanters, honest faith of, 203.
 Coventry, Sir John, maimed, 379.
 Cowley, respecting Cromwell, 66.
 Cowper, 77.
 Coxe, Wm., quoted, 455, 456, 459, 465, 467.
 Cranfield, Gov. N. H., 205.
 Creeds and cliques, 3.
 Cromwell, Oliver, Protectorate of, 57; early services of, forbidden to emigrate, 58; his officers and bones, 58, 59; hypocrisy of, 65, 337; his part, 77; rebellion of, 103; and Charles I., 178, 180; and Wheel-right, 204, 242; government of the Saints, 303; respecting monarchy, and Mass., 330, 331; a revolutionist, 348; no friends but agents, 348; moved by God, 348; a meddler, 348; closing parliament, 348, assuming a title, 348; protector, 349; "an usurper," 349; a traitor, 350; false to his own theory, 350; Pope's line upon, 350; prejudices against, 350; familiar habits of, 351; in constant fear, 351; false to his wife, 351; ceremony of, 351; fasts and prayers, 352; superstitions, 353; against freedom of the press, 353; secrecy of, 353; did not trust in God, 353; doubted everything, 353; deserted by early friends, 354; not a philosopher, 356;—Richard, p. 354.
 Crown, increased jealousy of, 286; accountability of, 322; made elective, 434.
 Crusades, of different dates, 83.
 Culpepper, Gov., of Va., 181.
 Cushman, Robert, sermon of, 121.
 Cuvier, Baron, philosophy of, 120.
- D**
- Dalrymple, Sir John, quoted, 332, 370, 372, 376, 421.
 D'Aubigné, quoted, 3.
 Danby, Earl of, infamous course of, 391.
 Daniel, the prophet, 241.
 Darius, King, discussion before, 485.
 Dashwood, Sir Francis, stupidity of, 603.
 Davenant, Sir Wm., and Md., 230.
 Davis' History of China, 8.
 Davis, Isaac, respecting Roger Williams, 160.
 Debtors, in prison, 208.
 Declaration of Rights, Mass., 331.
 Declaration of Right, 305, 425, 433, 441.
 Defeat, means of success, 20.
 Death, declared "an eternal sleep," 50.
 Delty, idea of, 8; centre of all tribes and nations, 81; attributes of, 310; wisdom of, 811.
 Delaware, State of, 244.
 Delphian Oracle, 81.
 Democracy, maxim of, 16; history of, 17; meaning and power of the word, 21; mission of, 23; under all forms of government, 23; champion of, 22; defined by Gov. Allen, 23; defined in 3d century, 22; maxims of, 24; a permanent element of progress, 25; Kings and Emperors, its servants, 25; dependent on knowledge, 26; in France, 21; in 16th century, 49; pyramid of, 73; proud records of, in England, 77; Addison, respecting, 77; sacred feature of, 78; basis of, 80; of the Bible, 83; triumphs of, 86; favored by Catholic and Protestant, 102; in Parliament, 104; no new system, 116; standard of, 117; blessings of, 118; results of, 200; recognized by royalty, 222; in Maryland, 230; and papacy in America, 231; illustrated by a Quaker, 231; progress of, in N. E., 278; heart of, in N. E., 278; government of, in R. I., 278; in Conn., vigilance of, 280; and its combinations, 280; not chaos, 292; idolatry of, 296; treachery to, 296; and toryism, 314; opponents of, in Am., 320; defenders of, 339; same everywhere, 345; representatives of, 373; concession to, 427; splendid triumphs of, 439, 529; compliment to, 441; not partisanship, 454; and woman, 490; unchangeable, 513; superior to monarchy, 530; superior to toryism, 531; always triumphs, 543; decency of, 523; practical period of, 595; and toryism never mix, 608; gifted spirits of, 612.
 Democratic Party, principles of, 21; dead, 414; statesmen of, 415.
 Democrats, of England, 77; of England and Holland, 193, '4; of America, not favorable to a monarchy, 333; and Tories, difference, 335; majority in commons, 423; nothing to alter, 425; selected as advisers by William of Orange, 434; and Tories, representative men, 542.
 De Lolme, quoted, respecting Puritans, 109; quoted, 307, 317, 319.
 Despotism, obliged "to truck and huckster," 294.
 De Tocqueville, on democracy, 27; his "Democracy in America," 28; France, 47; quoted, 124, 329.
 Devonshire, duke of, Septennial bill, 516; removed, 605.
 Devonshire paper, recitals of, 426.
 Diamonds, box of, as a bribe, 386.
 Dickinson, John, on monarchy, 325; Botta, respecting, 328.
 D'Israeli, referred to, 623.
 Didius, Julianus, bought Rome, 43.
 Dilke, Sir Charles, and reform, 75; quoted, 621.

Dinwiddie, Gov., 183.
 Discretion of a judge, law of tyrants, 572.
 Dissection, denounced, 11.
 Dissenters, laws against, 242; watched, 405; acting together, 412; persecuted by Tories, 444; dangerous to Church and State, 445; not political partizans, 535.
 Distress, caused by monopolies, 99.
 Donatello, 13.
 Dongan, Gov. of N. Y., 201.
 Dorchester, [Mass.] Georgia, 214; and S. C., 214; date of settlement, 277.
 Borr, Gov., of R. I., 160.
 Dresses, business of renting, 420.
 Druids, groves of, 55.
 Drummer, Jer., defence of, 281.
 "Drum, drum, I say," Conn. command, 285.
 Duchess, of Portsmouth, 383; of Cleveland, 383.
 Duke of York, 189; agents, 231, 285.
 Duke of Sussex, remarks of, 73.
 Dunkards, non resistants, 248.
 Dunkirk, sale of, 367.
 Dumas, respecting French revolution, 51.
 Dunce, consolation of, 460.
 Durham, Lord Bishop of, 136.
 Dunlap, quoted, 203.
 Dutch, West India Co., 189, 200, popular freedom of, 193; republicans 200; in Penn., 231; conservative, 188.
 Duty, pride of, 120; courage of, 131; political relations of, 298.
 Dyckvelt, in England, 420; character of, 420.

E

Earth, products of, 137; has its own record, 288.
 Ecclesiastical Commission, members of, 419.
 Education, duties of, 29; popular, 131; and state sovereignty, 133; errors respecting, 133; in France and China, 134; in Russia, 134; in different countries, 135; and democracy, 140; necessary to citizenship, 295.
 Effingham, Earl of, 77.
 Egypt, study of, 32.
 Egyptians, and the gods, 81; and their colonies, 93.
 Elections, fraud in, 402.
 Electricity, 90.
 Elliot, John, apostle of the Indians, 283.
 Empire, rudiments of, 573.
 Empire State, broad basis of, 200; Appendix, 633.
 Encore, Charlotte, 484.
 England, democracy in 26; locality and early period of, 53; mission of, 54; ruled by foreign power, 54; "a cock pit," 54; domestic wars of, 57; republicanism in, 75; democrats of, 77; national wants, 108; time of Alfred, 134; revolution of, 148; not free till after 1688, 293; as viewed by the French, 300; royal pedigree of, 326; fearful crisis of, 336; political periods of, 344; from Cromwell to Geo. III., 345; and America, 346; liberty in, 370; great events of reviewed, 378; and France, relations, 400, 439; grand periods of, 427; began to realize her parts 438; female suffrage in, 477; commercial greatness of, 595; public debt of, 595; interesting period of, 613; Pensions and annuities, 622; representation in, 619, 621.
 English free thinkers in politics, 2.
 English clergy, monarchists, 331.

Enthusiasm of patriotism, 565.
 Epaminondas, self-denial of, 127.
 Ephrata, convent at, 248.
 Episcopacy, and Papacy, 97; proscribed, 165; in N. E. impossible, 283; new life to, 365;
 Equal rights, conditions of, 136; best commenced in poverty, 126; glory of, 140.
 Equity, insured by law, 4.
 Era, of sin and degradation, 369.
 Erasmus, and Luther, times of, 24.
 Ethridge and Wycherley, ribaldry of, 366.
 Erskine, 77.
 Europe, commotions of, 164; conditions of, 378; peace of, 457.
 Evelyn, quoted, 366.
 "Examiner," Whig Journal, 448.
 Exclusion Bill, 243 390, 391, 392.
 Exclusionists, remembered, 398, 403.
 Eurystheus, a King of Argos, 468.
 Expeditions of discovery, 13.
 External objects, influence of, 121.
 Ezekiel, visions of, 5.

F

Fabius Maximus, 482.
 Fable of the Trees, Lesson of, 531.
 "Fact, stranger than fiction," 139; without roots, 317; important facts in history, 390; singular one of the times, 512.
 Factions, numerous, 98.
 Faculties, commonwealth of, 287.
 Fanaticism, period of 61, 374.
 Fanatic, never doubts, 352.
 Fairholme, quoted, 285.
 Faith, without practice, dead, 361.
 Fanning, the unlearned, 188.
 Farmer and nature, 137.
 Farmer's Letters, 327.
 Fashion, rule and pleasures of, 480.
 "Favorite," of the Court, 599; described by Shakespeare, 599.
 Favoritism, its results, 606.
 Fearful instrument of adjustment, 77.
 Federal Party, 18.
 Fenelon, quoted, 305.
 Fenwicke, John, 235.
 Feudalism, in Britain, 55; rights and institutions of, 540.
 "Fifth monarchy men," 61.
 Filbert tree, and the mill-stone, 316.
 Filmer, on monarchy, 325; toryism of, 366; theory of applied, 38.
 Fine arts, how advanced, 13.
 Finch, Lord, could fight for Steele, but could not speak, 453; speech of, 453.
 "Five Mile Act," 243.
 Fleming, quoted, 312.
 Fletcher, Col., Gov. of N. Y., 283.
 Foley, auditor, cant of, 450.
 Foot-ball, and Cromwell, 204.
 Force, abhorrent to nature, 307.
 Fox, C. J. and Burke, breach between, 4; estimate of Pitt, the younger, 21, 77; quoted, 337; reception of by Pitt, 580; George, and the Pope, 239; doctrine of, 241.
 Formation of Parties, 4.
 France, democracy in, 26; during 700 years, 28; people of not free, 41; history of, 46; future of, 53; condition of, 126; revolution in, 1848, 293; independent but not free, 293; social peace of, 295; revolutions, 295; hostility to—a party sentiment, 335; republicanism in, 342; and England, rela-

tions between, 379, 380, 386; war against, 456; hostility to, 498.
 Franklin, Benjamin, influence of, 2; parties, 15, 84; pioneer of knowledge, 89, 90; review of Penn., 267; democracy of, 267; quoted, 274; and science, 291; anecdote of, 313; vanity, 461; letter of, 612; calls for candles, 612.
 Frearson, John, quoted, 620.
 Freedom, pedigree of, 162; settlements of, 170; popular—derived from the Dutch, 193; with or without Gin, 550; cannot come from slavery, 550.
 Free discussion, forbidden, 190.
 Free inquiry, universality of, 317.
 Freeman, Mrs., assumed name of the Duchess of Marlboro', 500.
 Freeholder, quotations from, 2, 5.
 Freedom of the press, 72.
 Freedoms and Exemptions, 195.
 Free Society of Traders, 247.
 Free speech, checked by royalty, 416.
 Frederic, Prince of Wales, sad case, 558; opposed by father and mother, 558; character, 559; a "changeling," 562; dying mother refused to see him, 562; death of, lines respecting, 564; alienated by Tories, 566; effects of his death on parties, 568.
 French Constitution, revision of, 326.
 French, North New Netherland, 199.
 French Revolution, 4; Lamartine, 50; blessings of, 50; how regarded by parties, 835.
 Fronde, quoted, 3, 24, 79, 311.
 "Fruits of Solitude," 250.
 Fulton, knowledge of, 1.
 Fundamentals, the general, 146.
 Future, mercifully hidden from man, 613.

G

Galileo, the astronomer, 10.
 Game Laws, of England, 620.
 Genius, rivalry of, 13; rights of, 356.
 Geographical line, from pole to pole, 94.
 Geology, knowledge of, 288.
 George I., welcomed by the people, 506; but little opposed, 506; birth and education, 507; marriage and separation, 507, 508; early character, 508; summoned by his wife before the bar of God, 508; clever sayings of, 509; uncertainties of, 509; mistresses of, 508; policy one of self defence, 515; and the Prince of Wales, 521; speculative age of, 524; "governed by bad Latin," 529; reign of, teachings, 529; death of, 530.
 George II. ascends the throne, 530; long reign of, 530, 540; monarch by birth, 532; person and character, 533. littleness of, 533; governed by his queen, 534; ignorant of politics, 534; domestic life of, 535; singular defects and incapacity of, 536; queen of, 536, friend to learning, eulogized by Dr. Clarke, 536; mistrusted himself, 538; first interview with Walpole, 538; idea of political strength, 543; his age one of corruption, 545; and Queen, unnatural conduct of, 558; with his dying queen, 564; would take another mistress, 564; account of by Thackeray, 564; painful domestic scenes of, 565; equal to a pawnbroker, 573; sends for Pitt, 580; impracticable conditions of 1761: his achievements, 585;

errors of, 598; his Queen and Walpole, 658.
 George III., indignity to, 334; who was he? 348; and Lord Marlboro', 503; propitious period, 586; character by Thackeray, 586; new policy of, 587; resolved to be more than king, 587; inexperience of, 587; his "own unadvised minister," 587; very honest, 588; tutors of, 588; anecdote of, 588; German Grammar, 588; only fit to read his Bible to his mother, 589; early loves, 590; choice of a wife, 590; was he a leader of party? 591; "George be king," words of his mother, 592; born in England, 592; Interior Cabinet of, 593, 599; respecting Lord Camden, 593; and the Tory Party, 597; errors of, 598; led by his mother, 598; dangerous policy of, 598; choice of men, 603; interview with Pitt, 609; sole trust of, 613; his reign, how far to be noticed, 615.
 Georgia, colony of, 206; singular origin of, 206; settled by exiles, 206; acts of Parliament respecting, 206; objects of the colony, 206; charter of, 206, '9; provisions of, 210; lines respecting, 210; political foundation of, 211; three classes of settlers, 212; projected industry of, 212; paupers of England, 213.
 Germany, democracy in, 78.
 Gibbon quoted, 7; on democracy, 20.
 Gideon, of Manasseh, 531; Drumah, 531; line of, unprotected, 531.
 Gladiators, described, 42.
 Gluck, 13.
 God, wisdom of, 5; devotion to, 12; rule of in all ages, 80; King above royalty, 110; discovers himself to every man, 240; will of, will of man, 301; works of, 370.
 "God is love," maxim of Wm. Penn., 234.
 Gods, mythological, divided, 5.
 Goethe, "The girl we love," 479.
 Good government, republican, 342.
 Goodwin, quoted, 353.
 Gorges, Ferdinando, Mason, N. H., 202, 208.
 Gospel, to the heathen, 8.
 Government, administration of, 4; object of, 4; best form, 23, 249; Ludlow's idea of, 62; true end of, 149; a part of religion, 239, 251; frame of, by Penn., 251, 253; divine right of, 251; by charter, 278; and law givers, 291; basis of, 293; limitation of all, 294; origin and objects, 300; what it is, 301; defined by Samuel Adams, 301; human and divine, 301; founded in opinion and confidence, 301; coeval with society, 303; of the saints, 306; defined by Mass., 306; good and bad, 309; illustrated by Solomon, 310; what it really is, 313; good—is fragrant, 313; administration of, 314; absolute, or democratic, 318; self, 340; realities of, 348; paralyzed by party, 366; narrowed, 612.
 "Governments perish when they change," 60.
 Grand Alliance, objects of, 457, 467.
 Granville, Earl, habits and character of, 577; and Pitt, 604.
 Gray, Edward, property of, 127.
 Great men, in different ages, 33; defects of, 460; considerations respecting, 463.
 Greatness, human, and weakness, 460; and littleness, 532.
 Great Seal, thrown into the Thames, 423.
 Greeks, colonies of, 92.
 Growth, remarkable example of, 316.

Guarantee, political, what it is, 540.
 Gwynne, Nell, anecdote of, 383.
 Guiscard's attempt to assassinate Harley, 502.
 Guizot, F., respecting democracy, 21; quoted, 32, 46, 51, 52, 61, 108, 128, 168, 292, 295, 303, 314; respecting kings and Cromwell, 327, 348, 353; revolution of 1688, 427; power and natural laws, 462; quoted, 540.
 Gun powder, discovery of, 97.
 Guttenburg, 138.

H

Habeas Corpus, anecdote disputed, 71; test of principle, 571.
 Habits of society, 541.
 Hale, Sir Matthew, 261.
 Halifax, Lord, letter of, 420; a trimmer, 623.
 Hallam, Henry, respecting France, 49; British Constitution, 319; commerce of England, 595.
 Hamilton, Alex., respecting woman, 482.
 Hampden, John, 77, 373; Exclusion Bill, 391.
 Hancock, John, 84.
 Handel, G. F., 13.
 Harley, Robert, "the trickster," 455, 497; life attempted, 502.
 Hartford, Conn., "train bands" of, 285.
 Harvey, Wm., theory of the blood, 11.
 Harvey, Gov. of Va., 224.
 "Hate all, curse all," 16.
 Hate, logic of, 597.
 Hawley, Joseph, of Mass., 84.
 Hen, does not announce the morning, 487.
 Haydn, Joseph, 13.
 Henry, Joseph, report of, 6; aid to Morse, 90.
 Henry, Patrick, genius of democracy, 23.
 Heptarchy, period of, 55; and monarchy, 320.
 Hercules, mythological character of, 463; myth of, what it teaches, 463; made a martyr, 464.
 Herod, and Herodius, 486.
 Heroes, band of, 614.
 Herschel, on the physical sciences, 87.
 Hervey, Lord, Boswell to Geo. II. and queen, 559.
 Hesiod, distribution of mankind, 397.
 Higher law, 529.
 Hildreth, Richard, quoted, 220, 273.
 Hill, Mrs. Abigail, Mrs. Masham, 455.
 Hindoos, Vedas of, 6.
 Hispaniola, supposed to be Ophir, 96.
 History, objects of, 29; uncertainties of, 32; brief chapters of, from Cromwell to George III., 115; political, objects of, 115; colonial, 155; as viewed by Greeks and Romans, 189; province of, 334; teachings of, 344; fables of, 534; must be written and verified instantly, 534; definition of, v.
 Historians, errors of, 133; duty of, 350.
 Hobbes, Thomas, views of, 366; politics of, 366.
 Holland, represented in S. C., 183; government of, 190; views of sovereignty, 194.
 Holles, Lord, proof against bribery, 386.
 "Holy Experiment," 248.
 Holy Sepulchre, rescue of, 83.
 Holy wars, explained, 565.
 Homer, battles of heroes and gods, 5; father of geography, 93.
 Honest men, discouragements of, 602.
 Hopkins, Samuel, 2.
 House of Commons 73; in 1773, 136.

House of Lords, "Incurables," 74; Cromwell's plan of one, 350; abolition of, 619.
 Howard, Mrs., and the Tories, 537.
 Huddleston, Father, 384.
 Human agency, 87.
 Human body, its members, 341.
 Humanity, always the same, 7; boundary lines of, 98; gifts of, 127; nothing impossible, that is necessary to it, 614.
 Human Progress, considered, 45.
 Humboldt, Baron, quoted, 288, 289, 302, 307.
 Hume, David, error of, 53; quoted, 109; Hobbes, 366; quoted, 372; not inclined to correct errors, 373; quoted, 399.
 "Hymns, of lofty cheer," 202.

I

Ideas, live forever, 116; moral power of, 239.
 Identity, moral, 130.
 Idleness, rebuked, 120.
 Ignorance, characteristics of, 10; fetters of, 26; no qualification for duty, 535.
 Ignoramus, acquittal of Shaftesbury, 393.
 Incapacity, no element for good, 535.
 Independence, cause of, 84; declaration of, 109; American, opposed, 328.
 Independents, in Parliament, 61.
 Indemnity, Act of, 364.
 Indian, no tribe, no home, 119; power of, 125; sympathy for, 143; treaty with, 143; fear of, 203; kind treatment of, 224; war against, 282.
 Individual and manifold diversity, 7.
 Indolent acquiescence, Hume, 16.
 Industry, and the tax gatherer, 99; results of, 119; practical, 126; of the colonies, 299.
 Inequality, subject of, 464.
 Inner light, the rule of conduct, 239.
 Inquisition, doings of, 10, 98.
 Insensibility, effect of sense of duty, 431.
 Instinct, always the same, 312.
 Institutions, and character, 131.
 Insurrection, in N. C., 187.
 Integrity, principle of, 130; and sovereignty, 130; grandeur of, 130; importance of, 534.
 Intellect, achievements of, 461.
 Interior Cabinet, origin of, 593, 599.
 Interest, reduction of, 552; importance of low rates, 552.
 Interview—extraordinary, 611; strange and fabulous, 611.
 Introductory, 1, 78.
 Inventive genius, 138.
 Ipswich, democracy in, 1765, 290.
 Ireland, represented in S. C. 183; Leland's history of, 226; oppressed by Cromwell, 349; injustice to, 437.
 Irish House of Lords, 226.
 Isabella, queen of Edward II. 482.
 Israel, shepherds of, 5.
 Israelites, followers of Moses, 80.
 Italian Republics, 78.

J

Jacob, race of, 2.
 Jacobin, the, 18.
 Jails, of England visited, 207.
 James II. 77; downfall of, 108, 182; and Mass. Charter, 277; record of, 372; at the death of Charles II. 384; seduced, 391; position of, 396; and Charles II., compared, 396; reference to his brother, 396; respect-

- ing himself, 397; speech from the throne, 397; against arbitrary power, 397; capacity of, 398; disposition of, 398; as a man, 399; his choice of tools, 399; proclaimed without a riot, 399; had the benefit of parties, 400; early asked Louis for money, 400; motives of, 402; consistent tyrant, 411; advisers of, 412; how flattered, 412; as King, 413; not prepared to obey the Pope, 413; characteristics of, 415; incapacity of, 415; discouraged and desperate, 422; dethroned, 423; ready to do any thing, 426; indictment of, 431.
- Jealousy**, analysis of, 489.
- Jefferson**, Thomas, respecting Federalists, 18; independence, 84; life of, 179; and Washington, 301; Kings, 302; government, 303; British Constitution, 319; parties, 319; opposed to monarchy, 329; definition of a republic, 340; sphere of woman 488.
- Jeffreys**, Sir Geo., Chief Justice of James II., 399; infamous record of, 406; audacity and cruelty of, 406; insults to woman, 406; monster in human shape, 410; account of, 410; defence of himself, 411; end of, 411; in House of Lords, 416.
- Jenner**, Edward, notice of, 11.
- Jesus**, of Nazareth, 81; King of Kings, 278; ruler of nations, 333.
- Jesuitism**, popish puritanism, 109.
- Jews**, emigrated to Georgia, 214.
- Joash**, erected an altar to Baal, 531.
- Johnson**, Samuel, Dr., quoted, 396.
- Jotham**, a wise man, 531; speech to the men of Shechem, 531.
- Joubert**, quoted, 396.
- Judges**, discretion of, dangerous, 572.
- Jupiter**, thunders of, 5.
- Jury**, trial by, 141, 321.
- K**
- Kant**, Emanuel, philosophy of, 120.
- Keilmanssegge**, fat mistress of Geo. I., 509; made Countess of Linstor 509.
- Kendall**, duchess of, employed, 527.
- Kennedy**, J. C. G., quoted, 220, 222, 230.
- Kent**, James, Chancellor, quoted, 201.
- Kelland and Kirk**, royalists, 284.
- King**, "Jesus," "must come soon," 61; Lords and Commons, 74, 75; Wm. III., 77; James and the Puritans, 156; and Parliament, contest, 165; James, speech of, 172; character of, 173; grant from, 220; and subject, 240; office of, abolished, 331; of England, assailed, 336; glory of being, 397; of France, ally to England, 403; servant of the people, 440.
- Kings**, and Emperors, servants of democracy. 25; divine right of, questioned, 97; "*exil tyrannus, regumultimus*," 101; Guizot, respecting, 327; none in early ages, 333; how regarded in the Colonies, 334; how influenced by party, 597.
- "Kings' friends," 605.
- Kingsley**, Prof., quoted, 279.
- Knowles**, J. D., respecting Cromwell, 350.
- Knowledge**, power of, 131: "Knowledge is power," maxim, 133; diffused, 135; what it is, 312.
- Knox**, John, quoted, 5.
- Koran**, the, 6.
- L**
- Labor**, conditions of, 163; subdivisions of, 207.
- Lacedæmon**, republic of, 37.
- Laconia**, 202.
- Lamartine**, quoted, 138, 292, 307, 486.
- Language**, interpretation of, 32.
- Landholders**, of N. Y., 201, 620; untenanted, 620.
- La Place**, the astronomer, 89.
- Laud**, Archbishop, 220.
- Law**, profession of, 12; in the heart, 23, 293.
- Laws**, objects of, 4; results of imperfect, 126; revision of, 145, 147; good, and good men, 252; agreed upon in England, 257; of Penn. vs. laws of England, 271; of England, in R. I., 278; of capacity and principle, 293; human, 311.
- "*Lætatur*," medal inscription, 393.
- Le Brun**, 13.
- Learning**, in 1640, 131.
- Legislation**, in England, democratic, 77; of the Puritans, 140; ideas respecting, 142; progress of, 321; business of, 518.
- Leisler**, Jacob, above royalty, 202.
- "*L'Etat, c'est moi*," 296.
- Lewis**, William, a zealous Catholic, 230.
- Levellers**, and royalists, 65; claims of, 99; angry with Cromwell, 350.
- Liberty**, civil and religious, 68, 69; a curious fact respecting, 76; preserved in England by the Puritans, 109; contest for the greatest, 117; and property, 273; sources of, 294; in England, 370.
- Lingard**, John, quoted, 65.
- Lisle**, Alice, case of cruelty, 408.
- Literature**, Augustan age of, 448; allied with politics, 448.
- "Live and let live," principle of, 126.
- Livingstone**, Edward, Penal Code of, 132.
- Load stones**, early known, 288.
- Locke**, John, influence of, 2, 77; his frame of government in S. C., 184; theory of, 333; letter of, 390; proscribed, 405; a democrat, 406; respecting the colonies, 438.
- Logic**, nominal, 128.
- London**, Bishop of, 228; freedom of, 390, 395.
- London Gazette**, 401.
- "Long Parliament" revived, 354.
- Lord**, seeking the, 101; fear of, 137; will be king, 240.
- Lords**, House of, "humbly desired, etc.," 74; vote of, 424, 444.
- Lord's Prayer**, altered, 101.
- Lords**, Say and Seal, 277.
- Louisiana**, Penal Code of, 132.
- Louis XIV.**, government of, 316; person and character, 378; Macaulay respecting, 378; offers troops to James, 405; ambitious and unscrupulous, 458; female agents of, 434.
- Loyalty** to party, not to government, 354.
- Luther**, Martin, Schools in Germany, 135, 240.
- Lutheran Germans**, 248.
- Luttrell**, Temple, respecting royalty in England, 329.
- Lycurgus**, as a lawgiver, 36, 81.
- M**
- Macaulay**, Thomas B., respecting Cromwell, 60, 350; quoted, 243; charges against Penn. 263, 397; monarchy, 325; quoted, 360, 361, 380, 384; the Cabal, 365; quoted, 399, 401, 405, 409, 426, 427; questioned 430; compliments democracy, 441.
- Mackintosh**, Sir James, quoted, 3, 23, 55, 98, 135, 162, 115, 357, 417.

- Madame de Maintenon, 482.
 Madison, James, safety of parties, 15, 84.
 Magna Charta, 69, 71; second of England, 208; Irish, 226; new, 439.
 Magnanimity, the virtue of power, 457.
 "Magna est veritas," etc., party maxim, 16.
 Mahometism, its Koran, 6.
 Magnetic needle, early known, 288.
 Majority, principle of, 128.
 Maine, State of, 277.
 Man, agent of power, and subject of want, 2; early trained as a partizan, 2; governed by motives, 3; capable of progress, 29; duties of, 29; equality of, 166; good, bad, wise, foolish, 260; makes the world, 287; sphere of, 472; mission of, 473; shielded by Providence, 613.
 "Man's extremities, God's opportunities," 113.
 Manhattan Island, 188.
 Mariner's Compass, 97.
 Marlborough, the duke of, 424; record of, 459; mission of, and the age in which he lived, 460; greatness of, 461; loyalty of, 461, 469; affection for his wife, 461, 471, 494; as a warrior, 464; the Hercules of his time, 465; educated a Tory, 465; and James II., 466; highest ambition of, 466; "watchword of fear," 467; as a partizan, 468, 498, 501; loyalty of, 499; embarrassments of, 470; lost confidence in royalty, and in the Tories, 499; hard experience of, 501; and the people, 503.
 Marlborough, the Duchess of, respecting William, 440; and the church, 443; and Abigail Hill, 455; a Whig, 471, 494; of great capacity, 471; intimate friend of Queen Anne, 471, 482, 491; legacy to Pitt, 491; love of property, 492; mission of, 493; not controlled by theologians, 494; participation in politics, 494; against titles, 494; against office, 502.
 Markham, William, 246.
 Marriage, providential one, 381.
 Mars, voice of, 5.
 Marshall, John, maxims of democracy, 24.
 Maryland, colony of, 219; first settlement of, 219; population of, 219; and Rev. of 1688, 219; authors respecting, 220, 224; representative government in, 220; 200 years ago, 221; religious freedom in, 221, 224; agriculture in, 224; declaration of rights, 227; democracy in, 230; controlled by a papist, 275; and Penn., 276.
 Mary's Land, 219.
 Marvel, Andrew, character of, 373.
 Masham, Mrs., and the queen, 455; cunning agency of, 503.
 Massachusetts, Charter of, 1628, 123, 143; criminals of, 136; and Maine, 202; Churches of and Georgia, 215; territory of, 277; and Cromwell, 331.
 Mass. Bay, Province of, 277.
 Massasoit, treaty with, 143.
 Mason, Capt. John, 203.
 Mather, Cotton, quoted, 279.
 Maverick, Samuel, 121.
 May Flower, compact of, 113.
 May, Sir Th. E., views of Pitt, 584, 592.
 Mechanic, the, 138.
 Mechanics and strangers, 141.
 Medicine, Schools of, 12.
 Memory, faculty defined, 88.
 Men, returning to sports of childhood, 3; leading 158; limited motives of, 297; men as men, and as partizans, 435; always find their level, 535; the bad flattered, the good slandered, 535.
 "Men, not measures," 597.
 Mennonists, G. Baptists, 248.
 Merchant Adventurers, of London, 128; articles of agreement, 129; bravery of, 202, 203.
 Merchant, Interest of, 201.
 Merchant and navigator, 138.
 Mexico, ancient parties in, 5; republic of, 342.
 Mignard, 13.
 Millenium, and republicanism, 342.
 Military power, 308; necessity, 307; hateful, 353; condemned, 550; commissions, 569.
 Milton, John, quoted, 5; position of, 57, 77; quoted, 307, 473.
 Mind, faculties of, 87; supremacy of, 286; range of activity, 287.
 Miser, what he is, 127; biography of, 127; habits of, 136.
 Missionary Societies, 9.
 Mitchell, Sir Andrew, to Pitt, 614.
 Mobs, and plots, 99.
 Monarchy, no safety under, 119; not admired, 281; in Mass., 282; "of reason," 302; supposed origin of, 324; mixed, 324; theory of Filmer, 325; Brougham respecting, 325; John Dickinson, on, 325; elective, 325; exploded, 329; extravagance, 330; Colonists respecting, 331; not a party question, 332; did not emigrate, 332; Bible against, 333, '4; not popular in America, 333; as viewed by parties, 335; a party vote, 339; self-reliant, 341; severely rebuked, 532.
 Monarchists, democratic, 327; Washington surprised, 329.
 Monarchical, and regal republics, 331.
 Money, what it is, 36; without character, 191.
 Monk, George, Gen., 354.
 Monkey, in power, 460.
 Monmouth, Duke of, claim to the crown, 403, 404.
 Monopolies, bitter fruits of 99; formed, 167; opposed by Penn., 247.
 Montaigne, Michael de, quoted, 127; respecting Venus, 460; woman, 485.
 Montesquieu, Charles, Baron de, respecting democracy in England, 26; government of England, 306; quoted, 358.
 Moral equity, 145.
 Morals, and Reformers, 291.
 Morley, Mrs., assumed name of Queen Anne, origin of, 500.
 Morris, Gov., Message of, 266.
 Morse, Prof., and the telegraph, 90.
 Mosaic account of creation, 31.
 Moses, history of, 31.
 Motives, sphere of, enlarged, 95.
 "Mother country," always dear, 111.
 Mother's love, intensity of, 566.
 Mozart, 13.
 Murray, William, very able and honest, 577.
 Mutiny Act, 167.
- N**
- Napoleon I., respecting democracy, 48; escape of, 484.
 Louis, and democracy, 292; and the Presidency 296; not a democrat, 296.
 Napoleon element, in France, 51.

- National existence, conditions of, 119; greatness, elements of, 119; sources of, 120; political unity, 296.
 Nation, a new, of the past, 291; what constitutes a, 292; growth and boundaries of, 293; not an aggregate of men, 296.
 Nations, origin and growth of, 52; all represented in America, 125; growth of, 287, 292; beginning of, 290; should be studied together, 345; experience of, 347.
 Native land, love of, 111.
 Natural World, causes of, 144; laws and power, 462.
 Nature, considered rationally, 289; voice of, 294; democracy of, 294; and government, 309.
 Neal's (Daniel) history, quoted, 110.
 Neander's (J. W. A.) Church history, 6.
 Necessity, inventive aid of, 127.
 Niebuhr, B. G., quoted, 341.
 Neptune, tempests of, 5.
 Nero, learning of, 461.
 Neutrality, dangers of, 4.
 Newcastle, Marquis of, self deceived, 579; character of, 579, 580; anecdote of, 605.
 New Amsterdam, 189.
 New England, climate of, 122; plantations of, 165; traders from, 248; united colonies of, 277; democracy in, 278; name of, 278.
 New Jersey, territory of, 201; and Wm. Penn, 235; Bancroft respecting, 236; and Queen Anne, 237.
 New Hampshire, 161; first settlement, 202; discovered by John Smith, 202; united to Mass., 204; population of, 204; separated from Mass., 205; patriotic people of, 205; territory mortgaged, 205; democracy of, 205; circumstances favorable to, 206, 277.
 New Netherlands, 189, 190.
 New Plymouth, Laws of, 141; address to the people, 145.
 Newspapers, influence of, 595.
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 77, 89, 461; Thomas, 192.
 New York, first settlement, 188; party contests, 201; free legislature of, 201; "Charter of Liberties," 201; early history of, 633.
 Nicholls, John, quoted, 300; respecting Geo. III., 593.
 Nobility of England, and America, 166.
 Noddle's Island, 121.
 Non-resistance, 365.
 "*Non sibi, sed aliis*," 217.
 North Carolina, 187; insurrection in, 187; settled by Mass. people, 187; Tories of, 188.
 North, Lord, called to order, 21.
 Northmen, before Columbus, 291.
 North River, discovered, 188.
 "No petticoat government," 589.
 Nottingham, Earl of, of the Church party, 454.
 Nottingham paper, recitals of, 426.
- O
- Obedience, duty of, with liberty, 190.
 Oblivion, Act of, 362, 364.
 O'Callaghan, quoted, 190, 193; Bancroft questioned, 193.
 Ocean, in its depths, 289.
 O'Connell, Daniel, quoted, 349.
 Office, qualifications for, 535; not to be declined, 142.
 Oglethorpe, James, and Georgia, 206; family of, 207; poets' sung his praises, 208; and John Adams, 208; and Penn., 231.
 Ohio, Penitentiary of, 136.
 Oil, and Drugs, in Georgia, 212.
 Oliver's days, 2.
 Olive, Thomas, Gov. of N. J., 238.
 "Omnipotence and Imbecility joined," 462.
 Ouslow, Arthur, Speaker, long influence of, 546.
 Orange, Prince of, and Mary, 381.
 Orleans, duchess of, 484.
 Ostracism, origin of, 462.
 Oxenstiern, Count, quoted, 307.
 Oxford University, and toryism, 590; declarations of, 401; Decree of, 625.
- P
- Paine, Thomas, "Common Sense", 333.
 Paley, moral science, 292; quoted, 311..
 Paradise Lost, object of, 35.
 Park's (Roswell) Pantology, quoted from, 6, 324.
 Papacy and Democracy, in America, 231.
 Papists, in N. Y., 201; and Protestants, 227; and Presbyterians, 242; of Ireland, 367.
 Parker, Joel, respecting the Puritans, 109; the Quakers, 242.
 Parliament, acts first promulgated, 62; freedom of, 72; not feared, 157; committee of, 209; and Georgia, 206; organization of, 322; an unthinking council, 366; changes of, 371; insulted by the king, 394; rebuked by the king, 416; debates of, respecting the king, 423.
 Parliaments, names of, 76; frequent, 367, '8.
 Parties, political, Addison quoted, 2; formation of, 4; administration of, 4; in all ages, 5; in the prison, 6; errors of, 159; results of, 159; Whig and Tory, 300; their standard of principle, 345; die when false, 361; powerless when ignorant, 361; divided, 363, 414, 529; defined by Bolingbroke, 385; united against France, 456; "all alike," 468; conventional rights of, 515; habits of, 541, '42; desperate state of, 547; conditions of, 576; the two great ones of the world, 613; their aims and ends, 613.
 Party, principles of, 1; what it is, 1; its importance to science, and religion, 1; manifold moral power of, 2; based on spirit of babes, 3; "the afterwise," 5; its action and importance, 13; forces of, 14, 15; periods of, 153; progressive or permanent, 153; lines of, 336, '7; questions to, answered, 346; of Cromwell, in factions, 354; extremes of, 401; of the court, 416; of the people, trusted, 419; appointments of, 445; embarrassments of, 470; middle one, 487; violence of, 498; bitter fruits of, 528; appeals to young men, 544; men of, classified, 598.
 Pascal, Blaise, heresy of, 11.
 Passions, energies of the soul, 14.
 Patents, for everything, 99.
 Patriotism, conditions of, 12; and crime, 347.
 Patriots, of America, 84.
 Patroons, enterprise of, 195.
 Paupers of England—sent to Georgia, p. 213.
 "Patriotic leaders," 373.
 Peace, is national health, 294; a necessity to France, 458; treaties of, 568.
 Peerage Bill, a mistake, 516, 522.
 Peers, new ones created, 444.

- Pelham administration, 554.
 Pelham, Henry—Walpole's advice to, 577; made chancellor of the exchequer, 578; character of, 578; his conditions of control, 579; party of, powerful, 594.
 Penal Code of Louisiana, 132.
 Pendergast, J. P., quoted, 349.
 Penn, William, quoted, 137; his Province, 149; family of, 231; against surplice, 232; displeases his father, 232; became a preacher, 233; denounced for heresy, 233; studies theology, 233; arrested in Ireland, 233; firmness and consistency, 233; studied colonization, 233; a student at Lincoln's Inn, 233; Clarkson's life of, 234; marriage of, 234; sent to Newgate, 233; no friend to expediency, 235; motives of, 236, 237; his relations to the Crown, 238; powerful friends of, 238; proclamation of, 244; conditions and concessions, 245; sailed for America, 247; a democratic monarchist, 249; errors of, 250; character of, 259; peculiarities of, 261; loyalty of, 262; personal friends, 262; defended against Macaulay, 263; letter to Popple, 264.
 Pennsylvania, settlement of, 231; name of, 238; history of by Franklin, 267; controversies respecting, 268; grievances of, 27; democracy of, 276.
 Pensions, annuities and allowances, of England, 622.
 People, divide on public questions, 4; riches of the country, 283; nothing to do but to obey laws, 335; inconsistencies of, 358; terrors of the, 375; ignorant of their rights, 417; declared will of, 433; will of, 470; protected by democracy, 530; loyalty of, 546; cannot be forced into morality, 550; alarmed by the acts of royalty, 606.
 Pepin, of France, 82.
 Percival, Lord, 206.
 Percy, Lord,—and Hobbes, 369.
 Perfection—not expected, 116.
 Pericles, and Aspasia, 482.
 Periods of the 17th century, 77.
 Perpetuating influences, 542.
 Persia, Zenda, vesta of, 8; sacred basis of government, 81.
 Pertinax, murdered, 43.
 Pestal, Paul, revolutionist in Russia, 118.
 Peter, the hermit, 83; the great, 262.
 Peters, Hugh, quoted, 330.
 Petitioners and Abhorers, 372.
 "Petticoat government," 601.
 Petre, Father, 416.
 Pharaoh, prophesies against, 5.
 Phœnicians, and their colonies, 92.
 Physical science, study of, 87.
 Pierce, Franklin, quoted, 140.
 Pilgrims, in the "May Flower," 86; at Plymouth, 84, 109, 277.
 "Pilgrim's Progress," author of, 366.
 Pioneer, honor to the, 90.
 Piscataqua, settlements of, 204.
 Pitt, Wm. Jr., as minister, "he has no character," 21, 337.
 Pizarro, spirit of, 83.
 Place Bill, bid of the Tories, 570.
 Plague, of 1665, 390.
 Plato, did not speculate on the gods, 6; respecting divine things, 81.
 Plantation Governors, 271.
 Pliny, his love of fame, 461.
 Plots, of Wat Tyler and others, 57.
 Plutarch, quoted, 482, 630.
 Pluto, affrighted, 5.
 Poets, quoted, respecting woman, 475.
 Pollexfen, patron of faction, 407.
 Politics, a new science of, 29.
 Political history, what, 87; how useful, 572; objects of, 115.
 Political parties, of the Colonies, 154, 155.
 Political rivals, seldom agree, 527.
 Political darkness, a call for candles, 612.
 Polybius, on monarchy, 324; error of, 339.
 Pompadour,, Madame de, 482.
 Pope, the, in Great Britain, 55; a charter from Heaven, 82.
 Pope's nuncio, 413.
 Pope, Alex., lines quoted, 376, 613.
 Popery and Puritanism, 220, 228; great fear of, 375; and Protestantism, 433.
 Popish plot, 374, 402.
 Poppæa, of great beauty, 43.
 Popple, William, 264.
 Portugese, in Brazil and India, 95.
 Portsmouth, settlement of, 278.
 Portsmouth, duchess of, 484.
 Poverty, advantages of, 126; aided by necessity, 127.
 Power, subdivisions of, 340, 341; not far from necessity, 399; without moral principle, 457.
 Poyning, Sir Edward, his law, 226.
 Practice, against theory, 556, 557.
 Presbyterians, in Parliament, 61; and Independents, 362; of Scotland, 367; snivelling, 407; Jeffreys can smell them, 409; lying knaves, 408.
 Prescott, Wm. H., quoted, 134.
 Prince of Peace, 5.
 Principle, history of, 569.
 Principles, fundamental, 16; levers of progress, 296.
 Prisoners, to be transported, 209.
 Private motives made paramount to public good, 530.
 Privy Council, decrees of, 174.
 Profit, everything for, 190.
 Progress, spiritual, Froude quoted, 79; composition of, 207; human, 239; political and national, 287; not seen at short intervals, 344.
 Progressive measures, 116.
 Proprietary governments, 152.
 Property, definition of, 3; representatives of, 169; element of, 200; sovereignty of, 204; impersonal, 477.
 Protector, title of Cromwell, 349; "what's that?," 349; popular title, 349.
 Protestants, favored in S. C., 183; taught toleration by a papist, 276.
 Protestantism, defence of, 229; ally to democracy, 420.
 Protestant ministers, ministers of the devil, 230.
 Proud, quoted, 235.
 Providence, beneficent plans of, 297; beauties of, 347; rule of, 370, 376.
 Providence (R. I.), first government in, 278.
 Providence Plantation, 277.
 Provincial governments, 151.
 Provisional government, N. E., 277.
 Prudence, courage of, 121.
 Public opinion, delusions of, 358.
 Pulteney, Wm., against Walpole, 574, 577;

- political fate of, 576; "weather-cock," 577.
- Puritan, "ever a rebel," 60; and Cavalier, in S. C., 183; and the Dutch, 193; and Papist, 243; nonconformists, 243; rule of, preferred to royalty, 366.
- Puritans, respecting, 60; hardships of, 84; in England, 103; origin of the name, 103; three classes of, 102; in the May Flower, 103; in America, 109; justice to by Hume and DeLolme, 109; moral strength of, 109; human, 110; embarrassed by no theories, 111; political relations of, 112; they stood alone, 112; rights of in the wilderness, 112; experience of, 122; poverty of, 127; integrity of, 130; honor to, 139; legislation of, 140; invited to Md., 225; outposts of, 280; resigned to the will of God, 331; cant of, 361.
- Puritanism defended, 103.
- Pythagoras, saying of, 399.
- Q**
- Quakers, brotherly love of, 61; views of, 239; does not remove his hat, 241; conduct of, 241; suffered imprisonment, 241; whipped, 242; Parker respecting, 242; sufferings of, 243; would not be sworn, 243; favored by democratic rule, 248; in England declared for democracy, 249; commended to the King, 397; petition of, 558; opposed by the bishops, 558.
- Quakerism, a peaceful element, 239; and democracy, 231.
- Queen, Elizabeth, and the Church, 103; of Geo. II., influence of, 658; Henrietta Maria, 219.
- Queronaille, the beautiful, 484.
- Questions to be answered, 346; of mere party, 515.
- Quo warranto, writ of, 295.
- R**
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, quoted, 302.
- Ralph, quoted, 390.
- Rapin, quoted, 374, 390.
- Rebellion, 118, 281; of 1715, 409, 513, 584.
- Reeves, John, tory policy of, 339.
- Religion, promoted by parties, 6; polytheistic systems of, 6; in all States, 8; zeal in the cause of, 9, 10; has no occasional place, 46; always to be sacred, 80; foundation of the State, 80; periods of, 153; and politics, views of, 365; union of, with State, favored by Walpole, 551.
- Religious discussion, discouraged, 230.
- Religious freedom, in N. H., 204.
- Religious liberty, 160; feuds not to be noticed, 364.
- Renegade, a convenient tool, 369.
- Representation, in England, 619.
- Republic of America, origin of, 344.
- Republics of Greece and Rome, 34; ancient, causes of failure, 341.
- Republicans, from Holland, 200; in Conn., 279.
- Republicanism, in England, 75; of the Puritans, 248; defined, 339; etymology of, 339; indefinite meaning of, 339; its highest signification, 300; basis of, 301; is self government, 341; in different nations, 342; the best form of government, 302; not a party question, 343; of 1776, 304.
- Restoration, (Charles II.) means of, 353; source of joy, 359; events of, 362.
- Revolution, of France, ideal of, 5; of 1688, in England, 108, 181, 248, 322; of 1688, 424; originators of, 426; Guizot, respecting, 426; justified by parliament, 432; defensive, 433; benefits of, 434; triumph of democracy, 439; of 1848, in France, 292; necessity of, 377.
- Revolutions, of Europe, 164; a chapter on, to be in second volume, 615.
- Rhode Island, 159; territory of, 277; laws of England in, 278; second charter of, 279.
- Richelieu, Cardinal, quoted, 325.
- Right and wrong, 371.
- Riotti, Pauline, 484.
- Robespierre, of no party, of all parties, 5.
- Rochester, bishop of, a tory, 335; Earl of, and the Protestant cause, 416.
- Rockingham, Marquis of, 594.
- Rome, people of, 38; Bolingbroke, respecting, 41; the past of, 42; governed by the worst men, 43; the worst men of, 43; ignorance of, 43; conflicts of party, 44; causes of its fall, 44, 45; provincial system of, 95; education in, 134.
- Roman Empire, religion of, 7; extent of, 89; parties in, 38, 39; civilization in, 39; grandeur of, 40.
- Romans, Livy respecting, 89.
- Roman Senate, religious awe, 81.
- Romulus, and Remus, 42.
- Ronquillo, Spanish Ambassador, 399.
- Rossini, 13.
- Roubilliac, 118.
- Rousseau, Contrat Social, 128; quoted, 309.
- Royalty, and the parliament, 70; exercised a doubtful power, 112; nature of, 168; combinations with, 169; and sovereignty in N. H., 205; nominal grandeur of, 329; English records, 329; abolished, 331; failures of, 356; a crime, 357; conflicts of, 370; still found wanting, 396; nothing without democracy, 441; representative of, 504; has no enduring element of safety, 530; nominal power of, 531; incompetency of, 540; divided against itself, 566, 567; promotions of, 567; again found wanting, 586; propitious period for, 586; under difficulties, 609; its idea of honor, 609; its thoughtlessness, 612.
- Royal governors, contests with, 201.
- Royal infant, and maternal love, 521.
- Royal pleasures, 359.
- Royalists, spirit of, 363.
- Rubens, 13.
- Rudyard, Sir Benjamin, saying of, 54.
- Russell, Wm. 77, 377.
- Russia, people of, not free, 41; democracy in, 78; insurrection in, 118; influence of the Bible in, 118; seditious songs in, 118; army of, 120.
- Rye-house plot, "hellish design," 243, 374, 402.
- Ryleieff, Canrad, the poet, executed for treason, 118.
- S**
- Sacheverell, Dr., sermons of, 448.
- Saint Lawrence, river, 203.
- Saint Paul, character of, 263.
- Salic law, origin of, 481.
- Salisbury, Earl of, 222.
- Satan, malice of, 5.

Saxons and Normans, 870.
 Sayle, William, 183.
 Schism Bill, importance of, 444; in England and Scotland, 444, 445.
 Schlegel, respecting the sexes, 472.
 Schools, free in America, 133.
 Science, advanced by parties, 10; certainties of, 29, 30; leaders in, 79; periods of, 154; independent of opinions, 261; votaries of, 291.
 Scipio, the great, 43.
 Scotland, represented in S. C., 183; and N. H.
 Secret service money, 545.
 Sect, in England, Germany and Switzerland, professing the spirit of infancy, 3.
 Sectarian zeal, 231.
 Self knowledge, 183.
 Self reliance, centered in God, 121.
 Seneca, 10; and morals, 292.
 Septennial Bill, how regarded, 514, 516, 518; question of repeal, 570; urged by the Tories and opposed by the Whigs, 570.
 Sergeant, respecting Cromwell, 66.
 Sermons, seven hours long, 101.
 Sexes, comparison of the, 472.
 Seymour, Horatio, 633.
 Shaftesbury, earl of, 73; quoted, 368; tools of, 373; injustice to, 374; and Grand Jury, 390.
 Shakespeare, respecting woman, 488.
 Sheridan, quoted, "follow Fox," 4, 77; respecting sedition, 838.
 Shippen, Wm. character of, 518, 519; Pope, respecting, 519.
 Sicily, government of, 25.
 Sidney, Algernon, 77; a democratic republican, 357; opposed to Cromwell, 357; quoted, 385; defended, 387.
 Silk, product of Georgia, 212.
 Sismondi, quoted, 92.
 Sloth, and the Hyæna, 558.
 Smyth, Wm., quoted, 5, 64, 103, 322, 358, 360, 377, 420, 421, 424, 439.
 Smith, John, Social peace, first condition of, 296; N. H., 202.
 Society, diversity and unity of, 32; real and apparent aspects of, 53; mobile elements of, 314, '15; state of, time of Chas. II., 372.
 Socrates, the wisest man, 10.
 Solon, laws of, 16; and government, 292.
 Solomon, truth of, 187; quoted, 292.
 Somers, Lord, great ability of, 393, 425; quoted, 446.
 Somerset, duke of, in council, 509.
 Soul, wealth of the, 127; from time to eternity, 288.
 South Carolina, 182; first settlement of, 182; motives of settlers, 182; from every nation, 183; spirited sons of, 188.
 South Sea Bubble, 524; Appendix, 641.
 Sovereignty, national, analyzed, 122; foundation in principle, 122; as understood by the colonists, 123; of democracy, 123, 141; of absolutism, 123; state and town, 124; American Union, 125; importance of State, 126; prerogatives of, 126; of democracy in N. H., 205; asserted by royalty, 205; by the colonies, 278; belongs to the people, 196.
 Spain, loss of greatness, 119; independent, but not free, 293; colonies of, 294; distinguished women in, 477.
 Spanish Colonists, in Mexico, Peru, 95.

Sparks, Jared, quoted, 372.
 Sparta, children of, 37.
 Speculation, age of, 524; proclamation against, 525.
 Spiritual culture, 8.
 Springett, G. Maria, wife of Wm. Penn, 234.
 Spurzheim, philosophy of, 88.
 Standish, Miles, property of, 127.
 State rights, basis of, 341.
 States General and Sweden, 378.
 Statesmanship, strategy of, 532.
 Steele, Sir Richard, election, expulsion, and trial, 449; defended by Walpole and Addison, 449; writings of, 450; accused of sedition, 450; Pope respecting, 451; debate, 453; his apology, 453; inconsistency of, 519; democracy of, 523.
 Sternhold, 2.
 Stevens, W. B. Bishop, quoted, 207, 217; great ability of, 208.
 Stillingfleet and Wm. Penn, 233.
 Stone, Wm., Gov. of Md., 227.
 Story, Joseph, advice to young men, 22; quoted, 152, 231.
 Streeter, S. F., quoted, 221.
 Strength, laws of, 26.
 Strife, seeds of, 248.
 Stuarts, not in favor, 281.
 Stuart papers, importance of, 377.
 Stuyvesant, Peter, 191.
 Subjects of indifference, Paley, 16.
 Submission, when a crime, 282.
 Success, true sources of, 219; cannot follow violation of God's law, 584.
 Suffrage, female, 476; in England, 477.
 Sulpicianus, a bidder for the Empire, 43.
 Superstition, what it is, 83.
 Suspicion in diplomacy, beneath the dignity of a nation, 458.
 Swedes, in Pennsylvania, 231.
 Swift, Dean, facts of nature, 488.
 Switzerland, represented in S. C., 183.

T

Talleyrand, female agents of, 484.
 Talmud, saying of, 461.
 Tarquinius, Lucius, 39.
 "Tatler," for the ladies, 449.
 Taxation and representation, 476.
 Temple, Sir Wm., suggestion of, 378.
 Tennyson, lines on woman, 490.
 Terra Mariæ, Maryland, 219.
 Territory, foundation of interest, 123.
 Test Act, 390; of 1642, 444; repeal of, 554.
 Thales, and science, 292.
 Thackeray, respecting Geo. II. and Walpole, 539; Frederic, the Prince of Wales, 564.
 Thargelia and Thessaly, 482.
 Themistocles, and his child, 483.
 Theocratic rule, 140.
 Theology, dogmas of, 448.
 Theories, uncertainties of, 207.
 "The patriots are come," a ballad, 577.
 "The statesman," lines quoted, 575.
 The States General, 189.
 Things, knowledge of, 290.
 Thomson, the poet, 77; lines of, 209.
 Thurlow, Lord, anecdote of, 596.
 "Thy commonwealth come," for "Thy kingdom come," 101.
 Titans, sacred teachers, 81.
 Tobacco, order respecting, 164; use of, 175.
 Toleration, a virtue or crime, 98; honor of,

158; Act of, 1689, 429; not dangerous to the nation, 557.
 Tory, a name familiar to all, 2; democratic language of a, 529; "beware of," 578; language of, 316; to Pitt, 604.
 Toryism, characterized, 18; mission of, 20; "vigor beyond law," 338; enunciation of, 395; its achievements, 585; favorable period for, 586; can never mix with democracy, 608; enunciation of, 625.
 Tories and monarchy 331; alarmists, 335; religionists, 365; professed friends of James II., 401; their compassion excited, 409; evasions of, 423; errors and crimes of, 425; and the prince of Orange, 435; favored return of James, 436; treachery of, 436; preferred by the queen for office, 444; extreme measures of, 445; distinguished, 448; eight to one Whig, 504; their bid for influence, 510; their schemes disguised, 527; ministry of, 459; did not surrender when they lost power, 529; favored reduction of the army, 548; absurd disguises of, 558; outrage of parental affection, 566; resort to democratic means for restoration, 569; rejoice in a change, 592.
 Tory Party, origin of the name, defined, 17; creed of, by Addison, 19; Appendix, 617; effrontery of, 389; how headed, 416; Peers created by, 444; false to the grand alliance, 502; reorganized, 526; death of, 526, 591; fallacy of, 598; proscriptions of, 598; revived, 612.
 Town, and State sovereignty, 124.
 Town officers, in N. H., 204.
 Towns and Counties, origin of, 321.
 Trajan, ignorance of, 461.
 Treason, to appeal to the King, 283; and sedition Bills, England, 336.
 Treaties, to be made by the people, 282; of peace, 568.
 Trees, fable of, 531.
 Triennial Bill, reluctantly approved by William III., 516.
 Trimmers, political, 16, 497; Appendix, 623.
 Triple alliance, 378.
 Trumbull, J., quoted, 279.
 Trustees of Georgia, errors of, 217.
 Truth, invincible, 13; and justice, sources of strength, 120; certainty of, 135; independent of man, 240; independent of intentions, 260; and duty, obstacles to, 603.
 Truths, great, opposed, 2.
 Tucker, George, quoted, 179.
 Tullia, daughter of king of Rome, 42.
 Turk, how limited in government, 294.
 Turkey, Sultan of and Mahomet, 82.
 Turner, Francis, bishop of Ely, 412.
 Tyranny, fruits of, 23; early and bold rebuke of, 49; mission of, 136.
 Tytler, A. F., respecting woman, 483.

U

Underhill, Capt. John, 191.
 Union, the American, 140.
 United States, what is due to the ranks of, 295.
 Unity of power, 314.
 Universal reason, 239.
 Union of the best and worst men, 425.
 Union of England and Scotland, dissolution of, discussed, 447.

Union, political, little understood, 447.
 Utrecht, treaty of, 164.

V

Valeria, sister of Publicola, 632.
 Vane, Sir Henry, against Richard Cromwell, 355; birth and end of, 355.
 Vanity, has a place in the mind, 461.
 "Vanity of Vanities," 565.
 Vattel, quoted, 319.
 Vedas, of the Hindoos, 6.
 Vergilia, wife of Coriolanus, 631.
 Victoria, queen, 619.
 Victory, democratic, 393.
 Vipers, age of, 97.
 Virgil, invocation of, 89; birth of, 89; respecting woman, 488.
 Virginia Company, limits of, 113.
 Virginia, first colony, 151; mother of States, 159; representative assembly of, 166; colony of, 171; charter of, 172; population of, 172, 177; political character of, 175; government of, 175; hospitality of, 176; enterprise of, 177; history of, 177, 180; parties in, 181; and Maryland, 220.
 Virtue, that moves heaven, 311; "perfects herself," 27.
 Virtues, the cardinal, 573; of China, 4000 years ago, 573.
 Volscians, and Coriolanus, 631.
 Voltaire, respecting Cromwell, 349.
 Volumina, mother of Coriolanus, 632.
 "Vox populi est vox Dei," sacred feature of the history, 22, 78; ancient maxim, 78, 310, 335.
 "Vox populi est vox Diaboli," 79.

W

Wadsworth, Capt., of Hartford, Conn., 285.
 Wallop, interposition of, 407.
 Walpole, Sir Robert, error respecting the Army, 549; and the dissenters, 554; against persecution, 556; inconsistencies of, 556, '7; tired of excise experiments, 569; his defence against Wyndham, 571; not always true to principle, 573; resignation of, 574; created Earl of Orford, 574; great speech of, 575; and queen of Geo. II., 658; death of, 579.
 Want, the basis of business, 3.
 War, how it is defensible, 295; Chapter on, in second volume, 615.
 Wars, religious, explained, 565.
 Washington, influence of, 2; party spirit of, 15; birth of, 84; Monument to, 84; the Pope of Rome, 84; and the government, 292; quoted, 295; respecting monarchy, 329.
 Watertown, date of settlement, 277.
 Weakness, no aid to weakness, 579.
 Wealth, power of, 169.
 Wentworth, Peter, M. P., 1575, 103; a bold democrat, 103; a puritan, 103; his speech to a Com. of Parliament, 103; his loyalty to the queen, 104; faithful to official duty, 137.
 Whalley and Goffe, search for, 284.
 Whateley, bishop, quoted, 312.
 Wheelwright and Cromwell, 204.
 Whichcote, Dr., quoted, 302.
 Whig, a name familiar to all, 2; and Tory, distinction between, 15, 319; origin of the

- name, 17; and Tory writers, cited, 272; how regarded, 500.
- Whigs, misfortune of, 373; controlled in the Commons, 415; good conduct of, 424; alarmed, 442; distinguished, 448; hated in power, 454; anti-democratic, 459; and Tories, changed sides, 516; true ones always loyal, 520; distinction between, 527; not true to democracy, 529; true ones, 551; more prudent than lofty, 557; removed from office, 605.
- Whig Party, mistakes of, 516; forty-five years in power, 591.
- Whig and Tory Parties, difference, 597.
- Whigs and Tories, arrayed, 613.
- "Whig it with all opponents," 578.
- Whitehall, lewd scenes at, 366.
- Will, of central power, 316.
- William III., Prince of Orange, marriage of, 420; a democrat, 420; declaration of, 421; letter to British Army, 422; landed at Torbay, 422; sagacity of, 426; a Calvinist, 427; remarkable success of, 427; Prof. Smyth respecting, 428; Buckle, 429; arrival at St. James, 429; and Mary, proclaimed, 433; reign of, 434; character, 436; difficulties of, 436; as a partisan, 436; misled by Tories, 437; as a statesman, 437; a stranger in England, 437; and Am. Colonies, 437; confides only in democracy, 437; reign of expensive extension, 438; not responsible for his age, 439; accused of brutality, 440; King only of the Whigs, 453.
- Williams, Roger, 160, 277; banished Mass., 277; plan of, 278.
- Wilkes, John, birth, character and influence, 595; anecdotes of, 596.
- Wine, in Georgia, 212.
- Winchelsea, Earl of, 207.
- Winslow, Gov., 145.
- Winthrop, Gov., 165.
- Wisdom, human and divine, 311; defined, 312.
- Wood, Anthony, quoted, 222.
- Woodbury, Levi, quoted, 302.
- Wolfertsen, Jacob, 192.
- Woman, moral nature of, 240; feeble as an official, 455; mission of, 472, '4; sphere of, 472; characteristics of, 474; pictured by the poets, 474; history of, 480; vocations of, 481; as connected with government, 481, 487; influence on public men, 481; cause of revolutions, 483; as woman, 483, '4; Gov. Livingston, respecting, 486; and democracy, 490; how degraded, 493; importance of, 658.
- Women, crowds of at parliament house, 99; distinguished, 477, '8; during the French Revolution, 484; Am. Revolution, 486; employed by Tories, 487; as women, 633.
- "Worst things" prevailed, 43.
- Workmen against their employers, 295.
- Works, of Milton, Buchanan, and Baxter, ordered to be burnt, 57.
- World, external, phenomena of, 288.
- Wyllis, Samuel, Hartford, Conn., 286.
- Wyndham, Sir Wm., against Steele, 450.
- Y
- Yeardley, Sir Geo., 173.
- Yeomans, Sir John, 183.
- York, duke of, 381.
- Yorke, Sir Jos., to Mitchell, 614.
- Young men, party appeals to, 544.
- Young's Chron. of the Pilgrims, 113.
- Youth, impulsive, 544.
- Yu, doctrine of Confucius, 8.
- Yu, Emp. of China, 2204 B. C., 32.
- Z
- Zachary, the Pope, 82.
- Zoroaster, spirit of, 102.
- Zuylesteyne, in England, 420.

25
ju

APR 1 3 1937